7.17.97.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division PQ4390

Section .M82

Shelf

Number

STUDIES IN DANTE

MOORE

FIRST SERIES.

London
HENRY FROWDE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE
AMEN CORNER, E.C.

New York
THE MACMILLAN CO., 66 FIFTH AVENUE

STUDIES IN DANTE

FIRST SERIES

SCRIPTURE AND CLASSICAL AUTHORS IN DANTE

BY

EDWARD MOORE, D.D.

HON. D.LITT. DUBLIN; PRINCIPAL OF ST. EDMUND HALL, OXFORD

LECTURER ON DANTE AT THE TAYLOR INSTITUTION, OXFORD; BARLOW LECTURER ON DANTE AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON; AUTHOR OF 'CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE DIVINA COMMEDIA'; 'TIME-REFERENCES IN THE DIVINA COMMEDIA'; 'DANTE AND HIS EARLY BIOGRAPHERS'; AND EDITOR OF 'THE OXFORD DANTE,' 1894

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

M DCCC XCVI

Oxford
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

THIS volume forms the first portion or series of 'Studies in Dante,' which I am enabled to publish through the liberality of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press. The present volume necessarily appeals chiefly to serious students of the works of Dante. The *Second Series* will consist of miscellaneous Essays on various subjects connected with Dante, and will therefore, it is hoped, interest a wider circle of readers. Hence it has been thought desirable that the two parts should be published as separate and independent volumes.

The plan and purpose of the present Essay are so fully explained in the introductory pages that little remains to be said here beyond the acknowledgment of my indebtedness to many friends and others from whom I have derived assistance in various ways.

Among the friends who have kindly helped me, my thanks are due in the first place to Mr. Paget Toynbee, who, besides very kindly undertaking the great labour of reading and correcting the proof-sheets of this volume, has contributed at all times most liberally from his varied stores of knowledge and research on all subjects connected with Dante. These contributions will be found frequently, though still inadequately, recognized in the following pages.

I have also received most willing and liberal assistance from time to time, especially in the part of the work relating to Aristotle, from Professor Case of Magdalen College, Professor J. Cook Wilson of Oriel College, Mr. Grose of Queen's College, Mr. Stewart of Christ Church, and Dr. Henry Jackson of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Further, I must gratefully acknowledge my obligations to several previous writers. In the Divina Commedia generally, I have been constantly indebted to the exhaustive notes of Scartazzini, though not always able to agree with his conclusions. No one could attempt any sort of work upon this part of Dante without being so indebted. The notes of Mr. A. J. Butler, particularly in the Purgatorio and Paradiso, in which he has collected numerous classical and especially Aristotelian references, have likewise been very helpful. I have also availed myself of the wealth of illustrations which my friend the Hon. W. Warren Vernon has brought together in his excellent Readings on the Inferno and Purgatorio; soon, it is hoped, to be followed by an equally interesting work on the Paradiso. In the Convito I have derived very great assistance from the Appendix of Mazzucchelli to the 'Minerva' Edition, Padua, 1827, in which a large number of Dante's quotations in that work are identified. I have not always been able to agree with him, especially as to the references given to Aristotle. Moreover he has unaccountably omitted several quite distinct quotations, and in any case he never professes to go beyond those which are direct and acknowledged; only such, that is, as would be marked '*a*' in my Index. Another work that has proved helpful in the Convito is the *Saggio* of Monti, &c. (the 'Edd. Milanesi'), Milan, 1823. In the case of the De Monarchia, I have been saved much labour by Dr. Witte's elaborate classification of the quotations occurring there. But (as in the case of Mazzucchelli) he does not attempt

to go beyond acknowledged quotations, and I have found myself unable to accept some of the identifications proposed by him, particularly in respect of Aristotle.

Besides these general acknowledgments, I have always endeavoured to state from time to time the sources from which special information has been derived. But it must be borne in mind that often I may have arrived independently at results which others have published beforehand unknown to myself; and also in many cases my notes have been written before I became aware of what has been said or written by others in the same sense.

My best thanks are due to my late friend Mr. Henry Reeve, C.B., Editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, and also to the Proprietors of the *Review*, for permission to reprint such portions of the present Essay as appeared in the number for April, 1895.

Lastly, I must apologize by anticipation if (as I fear must be the case) some inaccuracies of reference should be detected. No labour or pains have been spared to secure accuracy in this respect as far as possible. The Indexes in particular have been read and re-read and verified several times. But as the references throughout the work, text and indexes included, amount to several thousands, it is hardly likely that any amount of labour could ever guarantee freedom from error. The work has occupied several years, and has often been interrupted by long intervals. I am conscious of a considerable variation in the technical details of the references which have been made under these circumstances. Sometimes a passage of several lines may be found referred to in full, sometimes under its first line, sometimes under the line containing the most striking point of a quotation. The labour of securing uniformity in details of this kind would have been enormous, and it would not have been worth while,

since no practical inconvenience can result from such variations as these. But for more serious blunders, which I dare not hope to have altogether escaped, as well as for conclusions in criticism or exegesis with which my readers cannot be expected always to agree, and which they may sometimes think altogether erroneous, I can only crave such indulgence as the extent and variety of the subjects dealt with, and the frequent difficulty of some of the problems involved, may perhaps be thought fairly to justify.

It should be added that the references to the numbers of the lines in Dante's prose works throughout this book are to those printed in the margin of the Oxford Dante, 1894.

E. MOORE.

St. Edmund Hall, Oxford:
July, 1896.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
INTRODUCTORY	1–47
DANTE AND SCRIPTURE	47–91
„ „ ARISTOTLE	92–156
„ „ PLATO	156–164
„ „ HOMER	164–166
„ „ VIRGIL	166–197
„ „ HORACE	197–206
„ „ OVID	206–228
„ „ LUCAN	228–242
„ „ STATIUS	243–255
„ „ JUVENAL	255–258
„ „ CICERO	258–273
„ „ LIVY	273–278
„ „ OROSIUS	279–282
„ „ BOETHIUS	282–288
„ „ SENECA	288–290
„ „ ST. AUGUSTINE	291–294
„ „ MINOR AUTHORS	294–299
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	300–304
ON THE TRANSLATIONS OF ARISTOTLE USED BY DANTE	305–318
INDEX TO QUOTATIONS. No. I.	319–358
„ „ „ No. II.	359–394
GENERAL INDEX	395–399

CORRIGENDA.

Page 6, 5 lines from bottom, *dele* comma after ‘ Corduba ’

,, 76, last line, *dele* ‘ nor are the words used in the sense of the original.’

,, 117, 8 lines from bottom, *for* ‘ Phys. III. i.’ *read* ‘ Phys. I. iii.’

,, 147 (also pp. 152, 3, 4 and 289, and perhaps elsewhere), *for* ‘ Mazzuchelli ’ *read* ‘ Mazzucchelli.’

,, 157, line 1, *for* ‘ Dun ’ *read* ‘ Duns.’

,, 195, line 5, *dele* ‘ (shield of Aeneas) ’.

,, 195, line 7, *dele* ‘ represented on the shield of Aeneas ’ and *read* ‘ set forth in prophetic vision by Anchises.’

,, 200, line 4, *for* ‘ Bowman ’ *read* ‘ Bowden.’

,, 259, line 29, *for* ‘ Cicero ’ *read* ‘ Dante.’

,, 264, line 18, *for* ‘ Dante ’ *read* ‘ Ulysses.’

,, 267, 5 lines from bottom *insert the reference* ‘ Purg. ix. 17.’

,, 286, 16 lines from top, *for* ‘ 7 ’ *read* ‘ 8.’

,, 376, line 8, *dele* this line.

,, 392, line 8 from bottom, *insert* ‘ 8 ’ before ‘ ll. 178 *seqq.*’

ADDENDA.

The following additional Scripture references may be inserted:—

c.	Gen. xlix. 9	Purg. vi. 66.
b.	Ps. xviii. 5	Inf. xxvii. 78.
b.	Ecclus. xxiv. 39 . . .	Purg. vi. 121–123.
c.	Is. xvi. 9.	Inf. xxix. 2.
c.	Rev. xvi. 9, 11	Inf. v. 36.

Also p. 284 in line 10, after ‘ however,’ *insert* ‘ in Lucan, Phars. iii. ll. 256–263. and ’

STUDIES IN DANTE

I. SCRIPTURE AND CLASSICAL AUTHORS IN DANTE

I HAVE had occasion before[1] to notice how Dante's numerous references to Scripture and Classical authors might frequently be employed for purposes of textual criticism, and also for the interpretation of difficult passages. But apart from any such special applications, the subject seems to me to possess a wider and more general interest of its own. For Dante's reading was so extensive, and his mind was, so to speak, so brimful of the varied learning thus acquired, that there is scarcely a page of his writings which does not exhibit its influence, and which consequently is not more fully and adequately appreciated when read in its light. I have now therefore endeavoured to make as complete a collection as I could, not only of direct and acknowledged quotations, which are very numerous (amounting to over six hundred), but also of allusions and forms of expression which either certainly, or with more or less probability, imply a reference to the language of some previous writer. The collection of this latter class of references must of necessity be very imperfect and incomplete. Every student according to the extent and character of his reading could doubtless add to it considerably. But in order to impose some definite limits to a subject otherwise practically inexhaustible, I have observed two main restrictions. (1) The scope of the enquiry has been confined to 'Scripture and

[1] *Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia*, Appendix I.

Classical authors[1].' To have included mediaeval and scholastic writers, especially St. Thomas Aquinas, would probably have about doubled the task, and indeed it would have been an undertaking for which I should feel even more incompetent than I do for the less ambitious one which I have now ventured to attempt. Moreover this work has been in many respects well performed by others, as, for instance, notably by Hettinger for St. Thomas Aquinas; by Lubin for Hugh of St. Victor; by Marriotto de Gagliole for St. Francis, and also for Aquinas. (2) I have also excluded merely apt illustrations, or parallel passages resulting from coincidences of thought. I have confined myself in the Index here printed to passages which (in my judgement at least, though others may not always agree with it) were likely to have been so far in Dante's mind as consciously, or even unconsciously perhaps sometimes, to modify the form of his language. Such at any rate are the scope and the limits of the enquiry which I have proposed to myself.

One advantage may perhaps be anticipated from the materials or statistics now for the first time collected and tabulated. They will, I hope, enable students to form a more complete idea than was before possible of the encyclopaedic character of Dante's learning and studies, and of the full extent and variety of the literary equipment which enabled him to compose works covering a wider range of subjects than perhaps any other writer, certainly any other very great writer, ever attempted. Our admiration is indefinitely increased when we remember the difficulties under which this surprising amount of learning was amassed; when we reflect that it was in the days before the invention of printing, when books existed only in manuscript, and were consequently very rare and precious, and difficult of access; when there were no helps for study in the way of notes and dictionaries, no conveniences for reference, such as divisions of chapters, sections, paragraphs;

[1] I have indeed made one or two special and occasional exceptions, as perhaps in including St. Augustine and Orosius under this title. Also some of the references to Albertus Magnus and the Arabian astronomers are too important to be passed over without some notice.

above all, no indexes or concordances to help the fallible memory (though, happily, no doubt less fallible then in proportion to the reliance placed upon it); when, finally, we add to all this the consideration of the circumstances of Dante's own life, a turbulent, wandering, unsettled life, one of which we may truly say 'without were fightings, within were fears;' one intensely preoccupied with fierce political struggles and anxieties, when 'politics' (if we may use so misleading a term) were a question of life and death to those who engaged in them, and defeat meant, as in Dante's own case, exile, confiscation, ruin. The varied and extensive reading of which Dante's works give evidence would be admirable if it had been exhibited under the most favourable conditions of what we call 'learned leisure,' and with the help of modern appliances, but under the circumstances in which Dante accomplished it it is nothing less than amazing. Nor are these considerations materially affected even when all allowance has been made for the occurrence of secondhand references and the occasional use of handbooks of extracts and quotations, or 'Florilegia,' on both of which matters we shall have a few words to say presently.

As Mr. Eliot Norton has truly said, 'Dante was born a student, as he was born a poet, and had he never written a single poem, he would still have been famous as the most profound scholar of his times. Far as he surpassed his contemporaries in poetry, he was no less their superior in the depth and extent of his knowledge.' Dante is a striking example of what Mr. A. J. Butler has well termed 'the incredible diligence' of the Middle Ages. We marvel at this in our life of feverish haste, as we do at the infinite patience and leisure of Indian and Chinese craftsmen. The learning of Petrarch is also very remarkable, but the circumstances of his life were much more favourable for its acquisition than those in which Dante lived.

This subject has already, in a partial way, attracted the attention of several students of Dante. In a partial way, I mean, because, although some writers have dealt with the quotations to be found in single works of Dante, and others

have written monographs on Dante's use of particular authors, yet no complete and systematic collection or discussion of such passages has yet appeared. None, I mean (1) covering all the works of Dante; (2) including all the earlier authors thus used by him; (3) embracing not only direct citations, but also allusions and references, many of which allusions are equally certain and even obvious, though not introduced by any formal acknowledgement. Such a collection, so far as concerns Scripture and Classical authors, though not including the wide field of Scholastic theology and philosophy, I have now endeavoured to present in the Index which follows. These statistics being, however 'incomplete,' yet as far as they go 'systematic,' enable us to form a judgement as to the comparative amount of use made by Dante of particular writers—a point on which some erroneous statements have before now been made—and also as to the extent or limits of his acquaintance with the writings of an individual author when these are many or various in character: the extent in some cases, and the limits in others, being alike remarkable.

It may be convenient to summarize briefly here the general result. If we include (*a*) direct citations, (*b*) obvious references or imitations, (*c*) allusions and reminiscences, it will be seen that more than 1,500 passages may be found that fall under one or other of these heads. It is obviously impossible to fix precise limits to the class '*c*,' partly from differences of opinion as to the certainty of an 'allusion,' and still more from the fallibility of the memory and the imperfect scope of the reading of any one student, even with all the help to be gained by modern appliances, and after all the labours of others in parts of the same field. It is eminently a case in which '*παντός ἐστι προσθεῖναι τὸ ἐλλεῖπον*.' However, starting from the above total as one likely to be approximately correct, or at least proportionately fair in relation to different authors, we may analyse the result further thus:—The Vulgate is quoted or referred to more than 500 times, Aristotle more than 300, Virgil about 200, Ovid about 100, Cicero and Lucan about 50 each, Statius and Boethius between 30 and 40 each,

Horace, Livy and Orosius between 10 and 20 each; with a few scattered references, probably not exceeding 10 in the case of any one author, to Plato, Homer, Juvenal, Seneca, Ptolemy, Aesop and St. Augustine, if we may be allowed to extend the term 'Classical authors' so as to embrace all those mentioned. Further, we suspect on two or three occasions a possible knowledge of Valerius Maximus, though he is nowhere mentioned by Dante. It is to be again remembered that Peter Lombard, Bonaventura, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, and, above all, St. Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, to say nothing of Alfraganus, and possibly other Arabian astronomers, fall outside the limits above proposed, though if they were included the above total would be very largely increased.

Probably what will at once strike most readers with surprise in the above summary is the very small use made by Dante of Horace. And the surprise will be increased when we observe that the quite certain quotations of Horace are only about seven in number, and that of these no less than six are from the Ars Poetica, the only one outside its limits being the passing expression, 'bovem ephippiatum' (which recalls 'Optat ephippia bos' of Epist. I. xiv. 43), occurring in Vulg. Eloq. ii. 1. This is certainly not the general impression, as appears from the following statements of two recent, well-known, and generally well-informed writers on Dante. 'Dante's prose works supply many quotations from Horace (Convito, *passim*).' And again, 'From the frequent quotations in the Convito, it is evident that Dante had a special predilection for . . . the Ars Poetica of Horace.' The conclusion here is more correct than the premises, for there is only one definite quotation from Horace (Ars Poetica, it is true) in the whole of the Convito [1].

It is interesting to compare with the results thus tabulated some passages in which Dante definitely expresses his admiration or preference for particular authors. The best-known of

[1] There is also a passage (iv. 12) where Horace is referred to in general terms, together with 'Solomon and his father,' Seneca and Juvenal, as having proclaimed the 'deceitfulness of riches.'

these is undoubtedly that which contains the celebrated selection of the five great poets of antiquity[1], viz. Homer (the 'poeta sovrano'), Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Lucan; after which Dante, with a splendid audacity worthy of Aristotle's μεγαλόψυχος, ranks himself as the sixth 'tra cotanto senno.' It is worth noticing that in the Vita Nuova[2], Dante's earliest work, he quotes illustrations of prosopopœia, to justify his own practice, from just these five poets, in the order, Virgil, Lucan, Horace, Homer, and Ovid; the quotation of Homer being taken from his citation by Horace in Ars Poetica, l. 141[3].

[1] Inferno, iv. 88 *seq.* [2] § 25.

[3] It is also interesting to compare with Dante's selection of six poets that of Lord Macaulay, who had of course a wider area of choice. He held the six greatest poets of the world (in the order of merit) to be (1) Shakespeare, (2) Homer, (3) Dante, (4) Aeschylus, (5) Milton, (6) Sophocles. When a plea was put in for Virgil, Macaulay not only refused to recognize it, but expressed the singular opinion that both Lucretius and Ariosto should come before him. With this again we might compare the advice given to a young friend by Erasmus, to avoid inferior literature and 'to stick to Virgil, Lucan, Cicero, Lactantius, Jerome, Sallust, and Livy' (Froude's Erasmus, p. 26). Also G. Villani, viii. 36, says that he was fired to undertake his History when he was at Rome for the jubilee in 1300 by the example of the works of Virgil, Sallust, Lucan, Livy, Valerius, and Orosius.

Chaucer is probably thinking of Dante's list when in Troilus and Criseyde (ll. 1791, 2) he writes:

> 'And kis the steppes, wher-as thou seest pace
> Virgile, Ovyde, Omer, Lucan and Stace.'

Here Statius takes the place of Horace as in the passage above quoted from Vulg. Eloq. It is a curious coincidence that in a passage which I lately came across in Rabanus Maurus (d. 856) the same five poets are selected for pre-eminence, but with a ludicrously different object. In a passage which is probably the most grotesque piece of fulsome flattery to be found in all literature, the author compliments an anonymous poetaster (whose works, it is needless to say, are not enrolled in the book of fame) by proclaiming his superiority to all those 'che anticamente poetaro,' and in particular just these five poets are singled out for unfavourable comparison with this new light. The whole passage is so curious that it is worth transcribing:

> 'Carmina nempe tua dico meliora *Maronis*
> Carminibus, celsi cantibus *Ovidii*,
> Odis quae cecinit *Flaccus*, verbosus *Homerus* (!),
> Corduba, quem genuit, Africa quem tenuit. (*Lucan*?)
> Hi quia protulerunt pomposis falsa Camenis
> Rite tabescentes morsibus invidiae:
> Tu devota piis connectis vincula verbis,' &c., &c.
>
> (Ed. Migne, iii. p. 1588.)

The next passage to be referred to is in Vulg. Eloq. ii. 6 *fin.*, where Dante, having occasion to give a sort of rough list of authors to serve as models of style, mentions under the title of 'standard poets' (*regulatos poetas*) Virgil, Ovid 'in *Metamorphoseos*,' Statius, and Lucan. (It will be observed that Statius now takes the place of Horace, and that Homer, writing in an 'unknown tongue,' could not be quoted as a model of style.) Dante then selects some prose authors, 'qui usi sunt altissimas prosas'; and these are Cicero, Livy, Pliny, Frontinus, and Orosius, 'et multos alios quos amica solitudo nos visitare invitat.' This is in some respects a curious selection, and Dante never, I believe, betrays any knowledge of either Pliny or Frontinus, nor does he ever again mention their names. The very noticeable omission of Tacitus (in whom Dante would have found in some respects a congenial spirit) is probably to be accounted for by the fact that his works were then almost, if not entirely, unknown, manuscripts of them being extremely rare[1].

One or two other passages may be briefly noticed. Near the end of the Epistle to Can Grande, Dante refers to certain works of St. Augustine, St. Bernard, and Richard of St. Victor, in order to defend himself against some adverse criticism of his statement that much of his Vision of Paradise involved mysteries beyond the reach of human language or even of human intelligence. These authors, however, except possibly St. Augustine, fall beyond the scope of our present subject. In Conv. II. xiii. he mentions his special study of Cicero, De Amicitia, and Boethius, De Consolatione, when weighed down with sorrow at the loss of Beatrice, and gratefully acknowledges the comfort which he derived from both of these works. The quotations from them in his own writings bear ample testimony to this statement. Lastly, we may refer

[1] The following statement of Boccaccio, Vita Dantis, § 2, amounts to no more apparently than a generalization made from the works of Dante, but the omission of Lucan is curious:—'Familiarissimo divenne di Virgilio, d' Orazio, d' Ovidio, di Stazio e di ciascun altro poeta famoso, non solamente avendo caro il conoscerli, ma ancora altamente cantando, s' ingegnò d' imitarli, come le sue opere mostraro.

to his own declaration of his thorough and complete knowledge of the Aeneid, which he puts into the mouth of Virgil in Inf. xx. 112–114:

'così il canta
L' alta mia Tragedía in alcun loco:
Ben lo sai tu, *che la sai tutta quanta*.'

The quotation last made suggests that we should say something as to the *extent* of the knowledge displayed by Dante with the works of the principal authors who have been mentioned. In the case of the Vulgate, it extends to the whole of it. Very few writers, mediaeval or modern, 'know their Bible' as well as Dante did. This intimate knowledge is shown, not only by direct citation, put by the frequent interweaving of Scriptural allusion and phraseology into the fabric of his diction. A similar generality of knowledge is found in the case of Aristotle, who, it is needless to observe, was only known to Dante through Latin translations. There is scarcely an important work of Aristotle which is not represented, and often very fully represented, in the pages of Dante. Especially well did he know the Ethics, Physics, Metaphysics, and De Anima. Only one remarkable exception occurs, in the case of the Poetics. This appears to have been wholly unknown to Dante, otherwise he could scarcely fail to have been struck with its bearing on many of the subjects discussed in Book II. of the Vulg. Eloq. In the case of Plato, no work of his is ever directly quoted, or even named, except the Timaeus. The reason for this is found in the fact, that though that dialogue was translated by Chalcidius in about the fifth century, very long before a similar compliment was paid to any of the works of Aristotle, all the other writings of Plato remained in the obscurity of the original Greek till about the twelfth or thirteenth century. In the case of Horace (to whom we shall return later), we have seen that Dante shows no certain knowledge of anything but the Ars Poetica, with one or two possible references to the Epistles. The Aeneid of Virgil (as Dante says himself) he knew thoroughly, and particularly, as might be expected,

Book vi. He also in one place (Purg. xxii. 57) describes Virgil as

'il Cantor de' bucolici carmi [1],'

and certainly imitates in his own Eclogues the form and phraseology of the Eclogues of Virgil; but he never quotes them (with the exception, of course, of the Fourth) as if he were familiar with them in detail. Also, he shows little, if any, knowledge of the Georgics, except one beautiful instance of reminiscence and imitation, which will be quoted below. In the case of Ovid, he knew well and used freely the Metamorphoses ('Ovidio Maggiore,' as, in common with other mediaeval writers, he sometimes calls this work), but there is very slight evidence of his acquaintance with any other work of Ovid, except that he once quotes the second line of the Remedia Amoris, and that we suspect occasionally references to the Heroides. Finally, of Cicero he knew very well the De Officiis (especially Book i), the De Senectute, and the De Amicitia. A few other works are once or twice quoted (the De Finibus about six times), but there is no certain evidence of his having had any acquaintance with the speeches [2].

The special character of the debt which Dante owed to the principal authors from whom he quotes may next be briefly described as follows. His whole system of physics, physiology, and meteorology comes from Aristotle pure and simple, either from translations, or sometimes, probably, as he is reproduced by Albertus Magnus. On these, as on most other subjects, Aristotle's authority was for Dante sufficient and final. To take only one instance. In Conv. iii. 5, Dante declares that 'by that glorious Philosopher to whom Nature, above all others, disclosed her secrets, it has been proved, contrary to the false opinions of Plato and others, that the earth stands fixed and immoveable to all eternity.' He adds that he will not repeat any of his arguments, because 'it is

[1] It is to be noticed that this occurs in a dialogue with Statius, whom Dante feigns a few lines before to have been converted to Christianity by the study of the Fourth Eclogue.

[2] On this subject see *inf.* under Cicero, No. 11.

enough for his readers to know, on the great authority of Aristotle, that this earth is fixed and does not revolve, and that it is the centre of the universe.' This characteristic passage sufficiently explains Dante's attitude on the subjects which we have mentioned. It is almost needless to point out that a large amount of the 'machinery' (so to speak) of the Divina Commedia, the personages introduced, the scenery and incidents in detail, are taken from the Aeneid of Virgil[1], and especially from Book vi. For his mythology Dante is at least as much, perhaps even more, indebted to the Metamorphoses of Ovid; and in a much less, but still not inconsiderable, degree to Statius. His historical allusions come chiefly from Lucan in the Divina Commedia, and from Livy and Orosius in his prose works; though his references to Livy are often inaccurate, and we suspect that they belong rather to Orosius, or possibly even Florus, or were perhaps derived from some historical epitomes. To Cicero he owes, as we shall see later, one of the most fundamental principles of his classification of sins in the Inferno[2].

It would not, of course, be correct to infer that all the quotations and references in such a list as we have given above are proof of direct acquaintance on the part of Dante with the original passages. Allowance must no doubt be made, in the case at least of some authors, for (1) secondhand quotations, and (2) the use of Florilegia. We may briefly illustrate each of these. The most obvious instance of the former is to be found in Homeric quotations occurring in Dante. Homer was, of course, inaccessible to Dante in the original, and there was no Latin translation of him, as Dante informs us in Conv. I. vii. *ad fin.*; adding the interesting remark that a translation of Homer, or indeed of any other poet, is impossible, since the poetic element would be lost in the process. It could not be done 'senza rompere tutta

[1] E. g. Cerberus, Charon, Minos, the Giants, the Harpies, the Furies, the story of Polydorus as adapted to Pier delle Vigne in Inf. xiii. &c. The beautiful scene of the Valley of the Kings in Purg. vii. is evidently suggested by Aen. vi. 679 *seqq.*

[2] See under Cicero, No. 1.

sua dolcezza e armonia[1].' What would be Dante's feelings if he could see the list of translations in a variety of languages of his own great work? His opinion of the futility of the process would certainly be confirmed by many, if not most of them. Dante, however, three times quotes Il. xxiv. 259—

οὐδὲ ἐῴκει
ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ παῖς ἔμμεναι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖο—

and once at the beginning of the Vita Nuova in application to Beatrice, as though at firsthand from Homer. But the source from which he obtained it, viz. Aristotle's citation of it in Nic. Eth. B. VII., is acknowledged in the other two passages, viz. Conv. iv. 20 and De Mon. ii. 3; and in the latter case with rather a peculiar formula, 'ut refert Philosophus in iis quae de moribus fugiendis ad Nicomachum.' Again, in Vita Nuova, § 25, a fragment of Homer is quoted through the acknowledged medium of Horace (Ars Poetica, 141). In like manner, no doubt, Dante obtained his apparently direct citation (in De Mon. iii. 6, l. 50) of the well-known dictum of Agathon, which is found in Nic. Eth. VI. ii. 6. 'Deus per nuntium facere non potest genita non esse genita, iuxta sententiam Agathonis; ergo nec vicarius eius facere potest.' Take again the case of Plato. Only the Timaeus, as we have already stated, had been translated in Dante's time, and this is the only dialogue which Dante quotes by name. When he cites opinions of Plato which seem to imply a knowledge of other Dialogues, he is evidently in many cases really quoting Aristotle's repetition of such opinions for the purpose of criticism. Often, no doubt, he may have been indebted for similar derivative information to Cicero, or perhaps St. Augustine, or St. Thomas Aquinas. Again the direct reference to St. Jerome, in Par. xxix. 37, is apparently derived from the citation of the passage by St. Thomas, Summa, P. I. Q. 61, Art. 3. (See Scartazzini's note, *l. c.*) In the case of Aristotle himself, since Dante's only access to

[1] Goethe's opinion was evidently much the same when he said of a well-executed translation of Calderon, 'this is only a stuffed pheasant as compared with a live one, still it is well stuffed.'

him was through Latin translations or paraphrases, such as those of Albertus Magnus, when he quotes directly from such works, it is virtually a firsthand quotation. Another interesting case of a secondhand quotation occurs in the reference to the courtesan Thais in Inf. xviii. 133, which seems to imply acquaintance with the Eunuchus of Terence. But it is evident, on more grounds than one, that this reference is obtained by Dante from Cicero, De Amicitia, § 98. This explains (*inter alia*) Dante's wrong attribution of the words to Thais. They are spoken by Gnatho, but in Cicero's citation this does not clearly appear; and though the context, regarded carefully, rather implies a speaker other than Thais, it does not necessitate it, and no other name but that of Thais appears in the passage. Moreover the fact that Dante treats Thais as an historical person seems to show that he was not aware that she was merely a fictitious character in a play, and that therefore the quotation was not taken directly from the play itself.

In Epist. x. § 10, Dante refers in a general way to the Comedies of Terence, but there is no evidence whatever that he was acquainted with them in detail, though they seem to have been much read in the Middle Ages. The same may be said of Plautus (mentioned in Purg. xxii. 98). A correspondent has pointed out to me a singular resemblance between a part of Dante's celebrated inscription over the Gate of Hell and a passage in Plautus[1]. But I have little doubt that if the passage was a conscious imitation, and not merely a coincidence of thought, Dante may have met with it in a Florilegium. Dante again is evidently indebted to Cicero for his quotation of the lines of Ennius about Pyrrhus in De Mon. II. x. ll. 62, &c. See under Cicero, No. 2. And again for his scanty information about the Greek word 'hormen' in Conv. IV. xxi. and xxii. See under Cicero, No. 12.

Dante knew something, though apparently not much, of Juvenal, and though he quotes him directly, as there is no reason to doubt, two or three times, it seems almost certain

[1] This will be found discussed under Cicero, No. 6, in connexion with the above reference to Terence.

that his manifest, though not quite exact, quotation of the well-known line, 'Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator' (Sat. x. 22), is derived, not from Juvenal direct, but from its citation by Boethius, with the form of which it more closely corresponds than with that of the original passage. Moreover, Dante introduces it by the words 'dice il Savio,' which, though not inapplicable to a poet (as in the Divina Commedia it is applied two or three times to Virgil and Statius), is more suitable to Boethius. Besides, as Dante elsewhere cites Juvenal by name, why should he not do so here, if he was aware that he was quoting his words? These and other examples that might be added show that we must occasionally exercise caution in inferring direct acquaintance with an author quoted.

There is another class of secondhand quotations, which raise the interesting question of what we should now call 'plagiarism.' One striking instance will suffice for illustration. In Conv. II. xiv. ll. 170 *seqq.*, any one reading the passage would suppose that Dante was quoting at first hand from the Arabian Albumassar, and then from Seneca; but as Mr. Paget Toynbee has pointed out in Romania (July, 1895), Dante is here copying directly and without acknowledgement a passage from the Meteora of Albertus Magnus[1], which occurs in the same context as that to which he has just before referred. But it must not be forgotten that in the matter of acknowledging quotations or borrowings the practice of modern and mediaeval writers is very different and must be judged by a different standard. The idea of 'plagiarism' is a comparatively modern one. Literary matter once 'published' (whatever that might mean) was formerly regarded as common property. Thus three of the early commentaries on Dante are often for pages and pages nearly identical, yet they are by different authors, and there is no trace of any acknowledgement of indebtedness. The same practice prevailed in musical composition also. Many of the most celebrated airs and

[1] It is curious that the passage attributed by Albertus to Albumassar is not to be found in his writings, so that Dante has probably copied a wrong reference also.

choruses of Handel, for instance, are simply borrowed or freely copied from earlier composers. But this practice was not then associated with any sense of literary dishonesty or unfairness. No more, in still earlier times, did the putting forth a work under the name of some celebrated author involve any sense of 'forgery.' Indeed, as far as I can judge, it was not usual to acknowledge a passage borrowed or quoted unless the author desired to fortify himself by alleging the *authority* of the writer thus quoted.

Next, as to the use of 'Florilegia,' 'Dicta Philosophorum,' 'Moralités des Philosophes[1],' and similar collections of extracts exhibiting 'the wit and wisdom' of various writers. Such collections were common in the Middle Ages, and in days of manuscripts only we can appreciate the utility, and even the necessity, of such works,

'Che noteranno molto in parvo loco.'

Many of these still survive in manuscripts, and others, amplified by successive editors, have found their way into print. Smaller collections were commonly used in schools for purposes of dictation, and then for what is now called 'repetition.' Nor could the works of classical authors, from their costliness, have been otherwise accessible to the ordinary schoolboy,

'quum totus decolor esset
Flaccus, et haereret nigro fuligo Maroni.'

Though more advanced students had recourse to public and monastic libraries, they were doubtless as glad to avail themselves occasionally of the help of Florilegia as we are to benefit by indexes and concordances, and, it need hardly be said, with as good right. Though one must not be tempted too far in pursuing this interesting subject, especially when it takes us beyond the limits of Dante and his practice, I may briefly mention some of the traces which the use of such collections has left in literature. (1) Certain passages of an author are found to be quoted by various and inde-

[1] A work under this title existed in old French and was widely known. It was very freely used by Brunetto Latini, who reproduces 'senz' altro' pages of it in his Trésor. (See Chabaille, *Le Trésor*, iii. p. 187.)

pendent writers quite out of proportion to the results of any principle of 'natural selection.' (2) Passages of a certain class, viz. those of an epigrammatic or sententious character, suitable for 'copybook headings,' though doubtless possessing some advantage in the 'struggle for existence,' are quoted with quite disproportionate frequency, as compared with those of striking literary beauty or general interest. The explanation would seem to be that they are 'such stuff as Florilegia are made of.' (3) A still more remarkable result is that, in the case of an author who has written works of different kinds, those which lend themselves to the supply of such extracts or sentiments are constantly quoted, while others of equal or greater literary merit fall into comparative oblivion. A very remarkable instance of this is found in the case of Horace, whose Odes were in the time of Dante almost unknown, while his hexametral works were freely quoted; thus fully accounting for Dante's description of him as 'Orazio satiro,' as will be explained later. As to the evidence of the use of such works by Dante in particular, there is naturally not much to be said. But I have noticed three or four suspicious cases. His usual habit in his prose works is to mention not only the author whom he is quoting, but the title of the work, and generally also the number of the book. This applies especially to Aristotle, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, and Lucan. I cannot here enter into the details of many of these 'suspicious' quotations, but I will briefly mention one or two as samples. In Conv. IV. xxix. l. 73, a quotation occurs from Cicero, vaguely introduced with 'dice Tullio,' without any book being specified. This cannot be identified, and perhaps occurred, thus wrongly fathered, in a Florilegium[1]. Again, a similar case occurs in respect of Aristotle, and in this instance it has been found in printed Florilegia, actually, though wrongly, attributed to him[2]. Though these particular works are later than Dante,

[1] See *inf.* under Cicero, No. 23.

[2] This will be found discussed later under Aristotle (No. 65), but it is worth noticing here that in this case also Dante departs from his usual practice by giving no further specification of its source than 'disse Aristotile.'

they are probably based upon earlier works of the same kind, which were a common quarry for later collections[1]. Two other cases may receive a passing notice. In Par. xii. 57 we are rather startled to find a line the exact resemblance of which to Eur. Med., l. 809 can hardly be accidental. Compare *βαρεῖαν ἐχθροῖς καὶ φίλοισιν εὐμενῆ* with 'Benigno ai suoi ed ai nemici crudo.' Such a sentiment, however, may well have occurred in a Latin form in a collection of 'Elegant Extracts.' Finally, in Inf. xxiii. 4, Dante refers to Aesop's fable of the Frog and the Mouse. Apparently Aesop never wrote such a fable. But we are distinctly informed by the old commentator, Benvenuto (writing in 1379), that there existed in his day a handbook of extracts from Aesop in which such a fable is attributed to him[2].

I do not believe, however, that such secondhand quotations play any large part in the case of Dante. For (1) he very commonly gives fairly definite references for most of the passages quoted, as I have just pointed out. And (2) the majority of his quotations are not for rhetorical effect or ornament, but for a serious and argumentative purpose, and consequently they are not at all limited to such passages as would be made current or familiar though Florilegia.

We have spoken hitherto chiefly of direct and acknowledged quotations. But in the case of Dante, or any other author, the allusive references to earlier writers are fully as instructive, and often present features of peculiar interest. They are, so to speak, more spontaneous, and reveal the channels in which the writer's thoughts naturally or habitually, and indeed sometimes but half-consciously, flow; his mind being, as it were, saturated or ingrained with the thoughts of his favourite

[1] Jourdain (Traductions d'Aristote, p. 21) mentions the existence of such a collection of extracts or *dicta* from the physical and metaphysical works of Aristotle in vogue quite early in the Middle Ages. Its authorship was attributed to Bede, but Jourdain thinks it was even older, and that it may go back to Cassiodorus or Boethius.

[2] Mr. Paget Toynbee has kindly sent me the following note:—'This fable occurs in a life of Aesop written in the fourteenth century by a Byzantine monk. It occurs also in the *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais, and among the "Exempla" of Jacques de Vitry: it is one of those translated by Marie de France, and included by La Fontaine in his collection.'

authors[1]. This is conspicuous in Dante's case chiefly in reference to Scripture and Virgil. The texture of his diction is, so to speak, 'shot' with a Scriptural colouring, and in the case of Virgil this intimate familiarity is shown (among other ways) by the frequent repetition of small phrases, and in particular of Virgilian epithets. The following are a few out of a considerable number that I have noticed. 'Superbum Ilium' (cf. Inf. i. 75; and add Inf. xxx. 14 and Purg. xii. 61–3); 'carcere caeco' (cf. Purg. xxii. 103); 'antiquam silvam' (cf. Purg. xxviii. 23); 'littore rubro' (cf. Par. vi. 79); 'miseris mortalibus' (cf. Par. xxviii. 2); 'vada livida' (cf. Inf. iii. 98); 'secreti calles' (cf. Inf. x. 1, where 'secreto calle' is the best reading)[2], &c. There is one other instance which deserves a few words in passing. Virgil's 'humilem Italiam' (Aen. iii. 522) undoubtedly suggested

'Di quell' *umile Italia* fia salute' (Inf. i. 106).

A variety of interpretations have been proposed for the epithet *umile* in this passage, which will be found discussed under Virgil (No. 16). I may add just two illustrations from the Vulgate of these 'quotations held in solution,' as they have happily been called. They are selected because this peculiar feature of interest attaches to them (as to many similar instances), viz. that familiarity with the original is assumed by Dante on the part of his readers to make his language effective or even intelligible to them. Thus, in Par. xii. 128, 129, Dante makes St. Bonaventura declare:

'nei grandi offici
Sempre posposi la sinistra cura.'

It seems to be agreed that his meaning is that he always regarded the dignity or emoluments of office as quite a secondary matter. But to describe these as 'sinistra cura' is hardly intelligible, unless Dante supposed that his readers

[1] Thus the Trionfi of Petrarch, the poetical works of Boccaccio, the Orlando of Ariosto, &c., abound with fragments of Dante embedded in the language like fossils.

[2] So also in the prose of his Epistles we find interwoven such expressions as 'malesuada fames,' 'praesaga mens,' 'Pergama rediviva,' &c.

would at once remember that Wisdom in Prov. iii. 16 declares that 'in her left hand are riches and honour.' Again, a little before, in the same canto (l. 75), Dante describes St. Francis's love of poverty by saying that his love was devoted

'Al primo consiglio che diè Cristo,'

or, in other words, to Poverty. He assumes that our minds will recur at once to the 'counsel of perfection' in Matt. xix. 21, viz.: 'Sell all thou hast and give to the poor.' So again, when in Conv. I. i. and Par. ii. 11 Dante speaks of 'angels' food,' 'il pan degli Angeli,' he is doubtless repeating a phrase familiar from Ps. lxxvii. 25, though giving it a different application. And the somewhat difficult expression, 'Pon giù il seme del piangere,' in Purg. xxxi. 46, is probably best explained by a sort of echo of 'they that sow in tears,' 'qui seminant in lacrymis,' from Ps. cxxv. 5. Once more, in Purg. xxviii. 80, he merely says that a doubt will be cleared up by the language of 'the Psalm *Delectasti*'; this word occurring in Ps. xci. 5, and not being even the title or initial word of the Psalm[1]. Similarly, when Dante periphrastically describes the sun as

'Quegli ch' è padre d' ogni mortal vita' (Par. xxii. 116),

or human nature as

'la bella figlia
Di quei ch' apporta mane e lascia sera[2]' (Par. xxvii. 137, 8),

he takes it for granted that we shall remember the saying of Aristotle (quoted by himself directly in De Mon. I. ix.), 'generat enim homo hominem et Sol,' or, in other words, that the heat of the sun is an essential factor in the production of human life[3]. Many more passages might be added in which Dante makes similar demands on the intelligence and instructedness of his readers, but they will be found discussed under the

[1] See again under Vulgate, No. 33.

[2] I am aware that this interpretation of the passage is not universally accepted. See further under Aristotle, No. 53.

[3] The numerous quotations in the Index show this context in Aristotle to have been specially familiar to Dante.

heads of the authors in which they occur[1]. In this, as in other respects, he takes it for granted that they are as full of varied learning and interests as himself, and if not, so much the worse for them. He will go his own way, and though he may warn those who are in 'piccioletta barca' (see Par. ii. 1 *seqq.*) of their danger of losing themselves, he will not pause in his impetuous course to help them. A recent anonymous writer has very truly said that far the greatest part of Dante's hardness comes not from his own want of clear thinking, but from his readers' want of clear knowledge.

Another way in which, short of actual quotation, familiarity with an earlier author or passage is shown, is by what we may perhaps venture to call the 'echo' of a quotation. The ring, so to speak, of a passage is in the writer's ears, and this determines or modifies the form into which his own words are thrown, even though sometimes the idea expressed may be a different one. As Spenser quaintly says: 'Having the sound of the ancient poets still ringing in his ears, he mought needs in singing hit out some of their tunes.' Though numerous instances of this will be found in the passages commented upon presently, I will venture, even at the risk of partial repetition, to call attention to two or three typical instances here by way of illustration. Thus, when Dante says

'Che gli occhi miei si fero a lui seguaci' (Purg. xxiv. 101),

he is not indeed quoting, but he is probably thinking of Virgil, Aen. vi. 200:

'Quantum acie possent oculi servare sequentum.'

I call this an 'echo' rather than a quotation, because the idea expressed by the similar words 'seguaci' and 'sequentum' is in a sense retained, though introduced in a different way[2].

[1] E. g. *inter alia* Statius, No. 8.

[2] We might perhaps venture to illustrate the kind of reminiscence described in the text by the form of our Lord's words on one or two occasions as compared with the language of the older Scriptures. Compare St. Luke xiv. 10 ('Friend, go up higher,' &c.) with Prov. xxv. 7: 'It is better that it be said unto thee, Come up hither, than that thou shouldest be put lower in the presence of the prince whom thine eyes have seen.' And again, St. John iv.

Such imitation as this is probably in some cases only half-conscious, but there is also another way in which it may sometimes occur. We all know how provokingly the *disiecta membra* of quotations sometimes float, like wreckage, in our memories, and, apart from books (Dante's normal condition), what patchwork we make when we think to quote or imitate a would-be familiar passage. It is not improbable that some, at least, of Dante's numerous 'echoes' of quotations may have had a similar origin. But be this as it may, I have noticed, especially in the case of Ovid, a tendency on the part of Dante to reproduce a rhetorical artifice by one similar in character, though the form of words may be altogether different. Such rhetorical artifices certainly abound in Ovid. He has even been characterised by a recent writer (though, surely, most unjustly) as 'more of a rhetorician than a poet.' I will merely put down, without further comment (since these and other similar passages will be found discussed later on), two illustrations of this. In the story of Niobe, which Dante evidently derived from Ovid, compare

'Tra sette et sette tuoi figliuoli spenti' (Purg. xii. 39)

with

'Orba resedit
Exanimes inter natos natasque virumque' (Met. vi. 301–2);

and in reference to the crime of Alcmaeon, compare

'Per non perder pietà si fe' spietato' (Par. iv. 105)

with

'Ultusque parente parentem
Natus erit facto pius et sceleratus eodem' (Met. ix. 407–8),

where both the sentiment and the rhetorical form are reproduced, though the effect of the repeated words is differently arranged. But I must not omit to call attention to the beautiful and touching 'echo' of a quotation which has been pointed out in the parting scene of Dante and

13, 14 ('Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again,' &c.), seems to give an 'echo' of Ecclus. xxiv. 21: 'They that eat me shall yet be hungry, and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty,' though the metaphor is applied differently.

Virgil in Purg. xxx. 49–51, as compared with that of Orpheus and Euridice in Georg. iv. 525–527. Compare

'(Volveret,) *Euridicen* vox ipsa et frigida lingua
Ah miseram *Euridicen* anima fugiente vocabat;
Euridicen toto referebant flumine ripae'

with

'Ma *Virgilio* n' avea lasciati scemi
Di sè, *Virgilio* dolcissimo patre,
Virgilio, a cui per mia salute die' mi[1].'

The pathetic repetition of the beloved name in three successive lines, and in the corresponding position in each line, is very striking.

I have already observed that we may suspect (even as sometimes 'bonus dormitat Homerus') an occasional lapse of memory on the part of Dante in quotations or references. One or two samples may perhaps be given of what seem to be imperfectly remembered passages. In Par. xx. 51, Dante describes Hezekiah as he who—

'Morte indugiò per vera penitenza.'

He seems to have confused two incidents—(1) his sickness, in which he pleads that he has 'walked in truth, and with a perfect heart, and has done that which is good in God's sight' (2 Kings xx. 3)—and it is after this plea that his life was prolonged for fifteen years—and (2) his subsequent lapse into pride and boastfulness, for which his penitence is recorded, and, as a consequence, the threatened national calamities were delayed[2]. Again, in Conv. IV. xxiii. Dante quotes St. Luke as saying that Christ died about the sixth hour, in order to prove that He did so before the decline of the day; as also He died before the age of thirty-five in order that He might not enter on the descent of life's arch. But St. Luke clearly implies (xxiii. vv. 44–46) that he died about the ninth hour, as SS. Matthew and Mark expressly state.

[1] The very line before this passage—'gognosco i segni dell' antica fiamma'—is a direct translation of Aen. iv. 23: 'Agnosco veteris vestigia flammae.'

[2] Possibly the reference to Stephen as 'giovinetto' in Purg. xv. 107 is another case. See under Vulgate, No. 63.

Virgil (Aen. i. 665) is very curiously misquoted, or rather mistranslated, by Dante in Conv. II. vi. The words are:

'Nate, patris summi qui tela Typhoïa temnis.'

Dante is aware that Venus is addressing Cupid, and yet he takes *patris summi* as the genitive after *Nate*, and not after *tela*, thus making Cupid the son of Jupiter! Further, he supposes *tela Typhoïa* to be the darts thrown *by*, and not *at*, Typhoeus. Again we cannot but suspect some misunderstanding of the celebrated '*Auri sacra fames*' passage, put into the mouth of Statius in Purg. xxii. 40[1]. At any rate, it is very difficult to explain as it stands. Finally, Dante's representation of Cacus as a Centaur in Inf. xxv. 17 seems to have resulted from a misunderstood or confused recollection of the expression in Virgil, 'Semihominis Caci facies[2].'

There is another way not falling under any of the above heads in which Dante shows his familiarity with Scripture in particular[3]. I mean by the introduction of details in the punishments of sinners, which have evidently been suggested by some incident or some denunciation to be found in the Bible.

We cannot doubt, for instance, that the punishment of those who were guilty of the sin of Sodom

'Piovean di foco dilatate falde' (Inf. xiv. 29)

is borrowed from Gen. xix. 24. 'Dominus pluit super Sodomam et Gomorrham sulphur et ignem a Domino de coelo.' Fire is also the punishment for the same offence in Purgatory, see xxv. 124; xxvi. 28. Those who give false counsel are involved in a flame—

'Ed ogni fiamma un peccatore invola' (Inf. xxvi. 42)

probably in recollection of James iii. 6. 'Lingua ignis est . . . et inflammat rotam nativitatis nostrae inflammata a gehenna.' Another case, perhaps, may be the filthy punishment of the courtesan Thais and others, 'Taide la puttana' (see Inf. xviii. ll. 112–114). Compare Ecclus. ix. 10, 'Omnis mulier quae est fornicaria, quasi stercus in via conculcabitur.' (This,

[1] See under Virgil, No. 24. [2] See under Virgil, No. 10.

[3] To some extent the remark applies to Virgil also.

however, in Dante, is the special punishment for flattery, though the epithet *puttana* may have suggested it.) Again (as I have pointed out elsewhere), the strange punishment of Branca d'Oria and others who have betrayed friends[1] seems to have been suggested by the language applied in the Psalm (liv. 16) to precisely that offence—'Veniat mors super illos, et *descendant in infernum viventes*.' Nor can we fail to recognize in the seven P's, representing the seven Deadly Sins (*Peccata*) engraven on Dante's forehead, and needing all to be removed by the expiatory processes of Purgatory, 'the mark in the forehead' of those who served 'the beast' in the Apocalypse, and the absence of it in the case of the servants of God. See Rev. xiii. 16, xx. 4.

I may now call attention to some cases in which Dante has directly borrowed or imitated the similes of earlier writers; such as, in Par. xxvi. 137, the fashion of the use of words changing like autumn leaves, from Horace, Ars Poetica, 60, 61, combined with 70, 71; in Inf. iii. 112 *seqq.*, the spirits in Charon's boat showering down like withered leaves, from Virgil, Aen. vi. 309–312; in Inf. v. 82–85, Francesca and Paolo gliding through the air like doves returning home to their nest, also from Virgil, Aen. v. 213–217; the tree bent by the wind and recovering itself, in Par. xxvi. 85–88, from Statius, Theb. vi. 854 *seqq.*; and so on. But when Dante has thus borrowed from other poets, they may be said to 'receive their own with usury,' for it is interesting to observe the wonderful transformation that the material borrowed has sometimes undergone in his hands. As a distinguished writer observed many years ago, also speaking of Dante: 'Reminiscences in great geniuses are like sparks that produce a mighty flame. . . . Much of a great writer's originality may consist in attaining his sublime objects by the same means which others had employed for mere trifling.' Without, let us hope, any suspicion of applying these last words to the case before us, we will examine one of the above similes—the second, which is also the most celebrated of them. For it is not original even in Virgil, being found in a slightly

[1] Inf. xxxiii. 129 *seqq.*

different application both in Homer, Il. vi. 146 *seqq.* (by whom it may have been suggested to Virgil), and also in Ecclus. xiv. 18[1]. A comparison of the corresponding passages in Virgil and Dante will show how little Dante owed to Virgil, and how, at any rate, he gave in exchange χρύσεα χαλκείων, as Homer says. The whole scene of Charon's boat in Inf. iii. is full of imitations and reminiscences of Virgil, but the particular simile with which we are concerned is as follows:—

> 'Quam multa in silvis auctumni frigore primo
> Lapsa cadunt folia, aut ad terram gurgite ab alto
> Quam multae glomerantur aves ubi frigidus annus
> Trans pontum fugat,' &c. (Aen. vi. 309-12).

Now observe that Virgil uses these two comparisons of the falling leaves and the migrating birds for no other purpose than that of giving the idea of the *vast numbers* of the souls preparing to enter Charon's boat: 'Quam multa . . . folia' . . . 'Quam multae . . . aves.' In Dante this passes out of sight, and there are three other distinct and very beautiful points of resemblance indicated by the simile of the leaves. His words are:

> 'Come d' autunno si levan le foglie
> L' una appresso dell' altra, infin che il ramo
> Vede alla terra tutte le sue spoglie.'

Note here—(1) The *gentle fluttering down* of the falling leaves as they are detached (*si levan*) from the branch in the 'calm decay' of autumn is compared to the feeble dropping off from the bank of these weary spirits (*anime lasse*, l. 100), νεκρῶν ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, as Homer would call them. On this Ruskin remarks: 'When Dante describes the spirits falling from the bank of Acheron as dead leaves from a bough, he gives the most perfect image possible of their utter lightness, feebleness, passiveness, and scattering agony of despair.' (2) The *continuous shower* of leaves, leaf following leaf till the branch is left quite bare, gives a vivid picture of the spirits casting themselves down in quick succession, one after the

[1] 'As of the green leaves on a thick tree, some fall and some grow; so is the generation of flesh and blood, one cometh to an end and another is born.'

other, into the boat below, till all have disappeared from the bank. Note 'L' una appresso dell' altra' in l. 113, and then

'*Similemente* il mal seme d' Adamo
Gittansi di quel lito *ad una ad una*.'

(3) Finally, the pathetic touch in the words—

'infin che il ramo
Vede alla terra tutte le sue spoglie,'

the bare branch looking as it were wistfully at all its own foliage strewed upon the ground beneath, is all Dante's own. The pathos of this may well be compared with that of the beautiful lines of Keble :

'See the calm leaves float,
Each to his rest *beneath their parent shade.*
How like decaying life they seem to glide!'

Even so (ll. 118-120) the lately crowded but now (though for a brief space) deserted bank looks down upon the crowded spirits floating away on the dusky stream below. There is one line which we have not yet noticed (l. 117)—

'Per cenni, come augel per suo richiamo.'

Virgil, it will be remembered, also refers to birds in his simile, and this probably suggested 'augelli' to Dante; but if so, what infinitely more effective use he makes of the idea thus 'echoed.' He does not merely duplicate the former simile, as Virgil does, but brings in an entirely new and very beautiful thought. He compares the spirits, passively and as by some resistless impulse following the beck of Charon as he summons them one by one, to a bird that cannot but obey its master's call, though it may do so 'disdegnoso e fello,' as he says elsewhere (Inf. xvii. 132), in another of the numerous passages in which he has drawn his metaphors from falconry. Even thus do these spirits blindly and unresistingly abandon themselves to their fate, Divine justice so spurring them on that they come to desire that which they fear—

'Sì che la tema si volge in disio' (l. 126).

Thus Dante has borrowed the mere germ, so to speak, of a somewhat commonplace simile, and transformed it into one

of the most graphic and beautiful comparisons to be found in all poetry. So if any one will compare the simile of the doves in Inf. v. 82–85 with Virgil, Æn. v. 213–17 (adding, perhaps, vi. 190–92 and 202, 203)[1], he will find clear indications that Dante had the model of Virgil before him, but no less clear evidence that in this as in other similar cases 'Dante imitando creò.'

Dante has a curious habit (for so it seems at first sight) which may be briefly noticed here, of placing side by side quotations from Scripture and so-called profane authors, balancing one against the other, as though they had something like co-ordinate authority. This, of course, Dante would not for a moment have admitted, though his language occasionally about Aristotle seems to come very near to it. In the same way the most casual reader cannot fail to have noticed in all the three parts of the Divina Commedia, but especially in the Purgatorio, how habitually the examples of vice or virtue are taken alternately, or in alternate groups, from Scripture or profane literature; e. g. Potiphar's wife with Sinon (Inf. xxx. 97, 98); Nimrod with Briareus, Antaeus, &c. (Inf. xxxi. 77 *seqq.*); Jephthah with Agamemnon (Par. v. 66–70); Goliath with Antaeus in De Mon. II. x.; while in the numerous examples for warning and imitation in the seven *Cornici* of Purgatory there is not a single exception to this symmetrical arrangement. The same tendency is sometimes shown in grouping *ancient* and *modern* instances, as Jason and Caccianimico (Inf. xviii. 50, 56), Myrrha and Gianni Schicchi (Inf. xxx. 32–39), Thais and Interminei in Inf. xviii. 122, 133, and many others; or, again, *ecclesiastical* and *secular* instances, as St. Lawrence and Mucius (Par. iv. 83, 84); St. Paul and Aeneas (Inf. ii. 13–33) as the only privileged visitors to the unseen world, one for the sake of the Church, the other for that of the Empire; or Sabellius and Arius on the one hand, grouped with Parmenides, Melissus and Bryson on the other, as instances of heretics, theological and philosophical respectively (Par. xiii. 124–27). One of the most singular examples of this

[1] See further under Virgil, No. 22.

tendency in the case of quotations is found in the pair of passages by which the triumphant advent of Beatrice is heralded in Purg. xxx. 19–21.

> 'Tutti dicean: *Benedictus qui venis*,
> E fior gittando di sopra e dintorno,
> *Manibus o date lilia plenis*.'

So in Vulg. Eloq. i. 2, the difficulties arising out of the use of speech implied in the scriptural narration of Balaam's ass, and in Ovid's account of the transformation of the magpies, are gravely discussed together. The Convito also affords many examples of this practice. Dante was, no doubt, familiar with St. Thomas's defence (in the beginning of the Summa) of this alliance of theology with secular knowledge as not implying any slight on the supremacy of Scripture. Indeed, we might well apply to Dante himself the language quoted by Aquinas from St. Jerome in reference to the early Christian apologists: 'Nescis quid in illis prius admirari debeas, eruditionem saeculi an scientiam Scripturarum.' The explanation of this practice on the part of Dante is to be sought in the fact that he considered the people of Rome to be as much God's 'chosen people' as the Jews, the one leading up to the realization of a Universal Empire, the other to that of a Universal Church. Roman and Jewish history were equally 'sacred history' for Dante. This is distinctly argued out in De Mon. II. v. Conv. IV. v. and elsewhere. The portents and prodigies described by Livy and Virgil are alleged by Dante as proof that God worked miracles for the Roman people as he did for the Jews. Virgil, 'divinus poeta noster,' is quoted side by side with Scripture (see De Mon. II. iii. l. 28, &c.), and his well-known lines 'Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,' &c., are cited as a proof of God's purpose of a Universal Empire for Rome as we should quote Scripture[1]. And in the Convito the term 'Scrittura' is often applied to Latin literature and to the writings of Greek philosophers, though Dante is careful to explain that there are various degrees of inspiration, and that the term applies to the

[1] See De Mon. II. vii. *ad fin.* and Conv. IV. iv. ll. 115 *seqq.*, 'Virgilio, ... quando dice, *in persona di Dio parlando*,' &c.

books of the Old and New Testaments in a unique and supreme sense (see De Mon. III. iii. ll. 72 *seqq.*). This belief in the guidance of God's Providence alike in what we call 'sacred' and 'profane' history seems to supply the key to the practice of Dante to which I have called attention.

There are two authors in particular towards whom the attitude of Dante calls for a few special remarks—Horace and Statius. It is known to all how Dante introduces Horace among the five great poets in Inf. iv. 89 as 'Orazio satiro.' This epithet has caused much surprise among critics, and has given rise to a good deal of discussion. We must observe first of all, that 'satiro' means 'moralist' rather than 'satirist,' and must be taken to include the 'hexametral' works of Horace generally, and not the 'Satires' exclusively, or even specially. Dante never shows the slightest evidence of acquaintance with the 'Satires,' and, had he known them, it would probably have been (as with mediaeval writers usually) under the title of 'Sermones.' 'Satiro' in fact means much the same as moralist, or 'ethicus.' The curious title 'Ethnicus' applied occasionally to Horace seems to be a mere blunder for 'ethicus[1].' The term 'satiro' is no less applicable to the Epistles than to the Satires proper, as being works abounding in maxims bearing on 'example of life and instruction of manners.' One writer supposes that Dante deliberately chooses the epithet 'satiro' to indicate his opinion of the superior value of this part of his work as compared with the Odes. It would be this, according to Dante, 'nel quale egli vive ancor.' The Odes, in comparison, would perhaps be thought of as 'nugae canorae.' The exaggerated rhetoric in which the writer referred to proclaims this view is rather characteristic of a good deal of modern Italian criticism: 'in quell' epiteto e tutt' intero un ragionamento di critica letteraria!' Another suggestion made is that Dante selects 'satire' as the distinguishing feature of Horace because it was the form of composition most original and indigenous at Rome, that in which pre-eminently 'vestigia Graeca ausi (sunt) deserere'; for, according to the well-known dictum of Quintilian, 'satira

[1] See Manitius, *Analekten sur Geschichte des Horaz*, &c., pp. 9 *n*, 68, 81, 83.

tota nostra est.' I believe the simple and prosaic explanation to be the true one, viz. that Dante was not acquainted with the Odes. He certainly never quotes or definitely refers to them; and it is more than probable that, had he known them, he would have been attracted by the numerous passages in which Horace appears as the panegyrist

'dell' alma Roma e di suo impero,'

as he was by similar language in Virgil. I do not, of course, mean that Dante was not aware that Horace was also a lyrical poet, but only that Dante was probably not himself acquainted with that part of his works. In this we are not left merely to probable inferences, or to the *argumentum e silentio* to be derived out of his own works. We have definite and statistical evidence of the oblivion into which the Odes of Horace had fallen among Dante's literary contemporaries and predecessors [1].

It may be added that the remarks of the early commentators on Inf. iv. 89 afford a curious illustration of the ignorance then prevailing about Horace. Of the ten or eleven who wrote in the fourteenth century, i. e. within about eighty years of Dante's death, seven profess to give some account of Horace, and, of these, only one (Boccaccio) mentions him as a lyrical poet. Some of the statements made about him are very grotesque. One [2], after describing Lucan as 'one who wrote about the battles of Aeneas, and of the same battles that Homer wrote about,' merely adds that 'Orazio Satiro spoke of these same things, and of many others.' Another [3] says that Horace wrote '*tragedies* (!) and sevèral epistles.' Another [4] romances in the following astonishing matter: 'Orazio fu grande poeta, et era deputato pe' Romani a correggere i libri che lasciavano i poeti, che eran tutti rappresentati a lui! Fece molti volumi di libri, la Poetria, le Pistole,' &c. Another [5]

[1] See *inf.* under 'Horace.'

[2] The so-called 'Comento Anonimo,' which is, in fact, as I pointed out some years ago in a letter to the Academy (Oct. 1881), the Commentary of Ser Graziuolo de' Bambaglioli.

[3] Jacopo della Lana. [4] The 'Anonimo Fiorentino.' [5] Ricaldone.

writes: 'Satirus fuit excellentissimus quoniam (!) magister fuit Virgilii et Ovidii; parvus corpore et magnus animo, loquens pauca.' Both the inference and the statement introduced by 'quoniam' are peculiar. And even Buti (generally better informed), in similar language, states that 'Orazio . . . fu valentissimo poeta, intanto che a Roma, ov' elli visse, fu fatto correggitore de' poeti.' This extraordinary invention looks like a 'mythical' embodiment of the 'Poetria' generally, and in particular, perhaps, of the passage, 'Ergo fungar vice cotis,' &c. (ll. 304 *seqq.*).

Dante's treatment of Statius constitutes one of the most singular problems or anomalies of the Divina Commedia. We are surprised at his enthusiastic, and, as it appears to us, somewhat extravagant admiration of a poet whose prolix and often inflated style is the very antipodes of his own. We have already seen that on one occasion [1] he has substituted the name of Statius for that of Horace when selecting the Latin poets as models of style, though in other respects repeating the well-known list in Inf. iv. This and other indications convince us that the name of Statius would have certainly been the next to be admitted to the charmed circle of the 'bella scuola,' were its limits to be enlarged. Indeed, Dante has in some sense 'provided some better thing for him,' for by the singular fiction of his secret conversion to Christianity he has secured for him the anomalous privilege of admission to purgatory, and of ultimate salvation, which is denied to so many that are 'greater than he.' The following are some of the problems or anomalies to which we have referred in Dante's treatment of Statius, on each of which a few words may not be out of place.

1. His alleged prodigality.
2. His pretended conversion to Christianity.
3. The peculiar *rôle* assigned to him in the Purgatorio.
4. Of what is he the type or symbol?

1. It will be remembered that Dante meets Statius in the fifth *Cornice* of Purgatory, from which he has just at that moment obtained his release. In this division of purgatory,

[1] See *sup.* p. 7.

in which avarice is punished, he is represented as having passed five centuries or more (Purg. xxi. 68), and in the *Cornice* next below, that of 'Accidia,' more than four centuries (xxii. 92, 93). Virgil is made to express his surprise that one so wise as Statius could have been stained with so sordid a vice [1]. Statius explains that his was the contrary vice of prodigality—'avarizia fu partita troppo da me'—and that in purgatory, as in hell, the excess and defect are punished together as connected forms of vice, on strict Aristotelian principles. Statius then declares that he was indebted to Virgil for his recovery from this vice, as well as for the more important boon of his conversion to Christianity, which comes later. In particular his reformation was effected by Virgil's well-known lines in Aen. iii. 56:

'Quid non mortalia pectora cogis,
Auri sacra fames?'

though the form in which these words are quoted by Statius is very difficult to explain [2].

'Per che (=quid) non reggi tu, o sacra fame
Dell' oro, l' appetito dei mortali?' (Purg. xxii. 40-41).

I am not aware of the existence of any such tradition as to the character and habits of Statius. It appears to be a pure invention on the part of Dante, as much so as the alleged conversion to Christianity. The object in both cases seems to be to connect the benefits received with the influence of Virgil, and with some definite passage that could be quoted from his works. What makes this particular invention more singular is that it is somewhat inconsistent with the picture of Statius's condition presented by Juvenal in Sat. vii. 82–87, which Dante appears to have been acquainted with, as will be

[1] Purg. xxii. 22. It is to be observed that Dante had a very special contempt for the vice of avarice. See *inter alia* Inf. vii. 53 *seqq.*:

'La sconoscente vita che i fe' sozzi
Ad ogni conoscenza or li fa bruni.'

Again Usurers are unrecognizable in Inf. xvii. 54. Note also the contemptuous comparison in l. 49. Observe also that in Purgatory their faces are concealed. See xix. 72. The same feeling appears conspicuously in the Convito, Tratt. IV. *passim*, and esp. ch. xi. to xiii.

[2] See *inf.* under Virgil, No. 24.

explained later[1]. For 'prodigality' suggests the possession of considerable means, whereas Juvenal implies that Statius was poor, and that even his great popularity would not have saved him from starvation, unless it had been supplemented by the more substantial support of Domitian's powerful favourite, Paris :

'Esurit intactam Paridi nisi vendat Agaven.'

2. Still more strange is Dante's fiction that Statius secretly embraced Christianity for some years before his death, though he had not the courage to profess it openly during the persecution of Domitian, a *tepidezza* which was expiated by more than four centuries on the *Cornice* of 'Accidia' (Purg. xxii. 73–93). And stranger still (though this is probably the key to the invention) that his conversion was brought about through the instrumentality of Virgil's prophetic lines in Ecl. iv. 5–7. That this language was in some sense 'inspired,' and that Virgil therein 'prophesied of Christ,' was a common mediaeval belief; but its application to Statius in particular is peculiar to Dante, and, as we have said, is intended for the glorification of Virgil, and also, perhaps, to enhance the pathos of the 'duro giudizio' by which Statius is 'taken' and Virgil 'left'; and by which Virgil, though able 'appresso Dio' (xxii. 66) to 'save others,' cannot 'save himself'; so that, in the touching and exquisite metaphor of Dante[2], he was

'Come quei che va di notte,
Che porta il lume retro, e sè non giova,
Ma dopo sè fa le persone dotte' (Purg. xxii. 67–69).

3. The peculiar *rôle* assigned to Statius in the Purgatorio is perhaps the least capable of explanation of any of these anomalies. His most conspicuous function is to be the vehicle of a sort of authoritative revelation to Dante of the truth as to the process of generation, the development of the embryo, and the origin and nature of the soul. This long digression occurs in Purg. xxv., a great part of it consisting in a *réchauffé* of Aristotle, De Gen. Anim., until a point is reached where

[1] See *inf.* under Juvenal.

[2] On the possible suggestion of this by a passage in S. Augustine, see *inf.* under S. Augustine.

Dante has to part company with Aristotle's guidance, and to follow Aquinas and other Christian teachers in expounding a Creationist theory of the origin of the soul (ll. 67 *seqq.*). When Dante raises the difficulty which leads to this 'revelation' as its solution, Virgil deliberately stands aside and gives place to Statius, who apologises for assuming the office of a teacher while Virgil is present (ll. 28–33). We have called it a 'revelation,' for such the exordium of Statius implies it to be:

'Se la veduta eterna gli dislego' (l. 31; comp. l. 36).

I cannot offer any explanation of the selection of Statius for this purpose; nor can one see what there was in his character, history, or literary qualities to render it in any way appropriate. He was, indeed, in one degree (as Scartazzini points out) more appropriate than Virgil, because, being supposed a Christian poet, Christian doctrines could with less violence be put into his mouth. But this qualification is itself a pure fiction of Dante's own, and does not, therefore, much advance the solution of the main question.

4. Finally, What, it may be asked, does Statius symbolize? The conspicuous part assigned to him—almost, if not quite, as conspicuous as that of the still more mysterious personage Matelda in the later cantos of the Purgatorio, and only surpassed in importance by the parts played in the action of the poem by Beatrice and Virgil—naturally disposes us to expect some definite piece of symbolism. It is easier to feel convinced here of the reality of a problem to be solved than of its solution. I should venture tentatively and with much hesitation to offer the following suggestion as perhaps worth considering *faute de mieux*. If Virgil (as is generally admitted) represents Human Reason, and Beatrice Revelation or Theology, we may perhaps suppose that Statius typifies something intermediate; such as Human Reason, generally enlightened by Christianity, but not specially instructed or interested therein; the cultivated 'lay' mind (not even the 'pious layman') in an age that has received the general impress of Christianity; a mind by which it is accepted and assumed rather than warmly embraced; one that is unconsciously

rather than consciously under its influence. Christianity has, of course, lifted the minds, the ideas, the knowledge of mankind to a different level, though they may not be aware of what they precisely owe to it. They breathe a different atmosphere, though they may be unconscious of its ingredients, and unaware of the degree or manner in which it has been changed for the better. Thus, as compared with any one who lived before Christianity was 'in the air,' 'the least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he,' just as, since the establishment of the Copernican system, the veriest tyro in astronomy is enabled to start from a higher platform than would be attainable even by a Ptolemaic Newton. I only throw this out as a possible suggestion. Dante *may* have intended to create a type of this intermediate condition between Virgil and Beatrice, between the highest type of pre-Christian intellect, or merely human reason, and the fullest development of the soul enlightened by the treasures of wisdom and knowledge which are imparted by revelation and dogmatic theology [1].

I will now proceed to point out the chief practical uses to which a systematic study of the quotations made by Dante may be put. The most obvious and important are found in the bearing of such passages on (*a*) questions of textual criticism, and (*b*) questions of interpretation.

As to the former, there is, as every student knows, a good deal of uncertainty about the text of all of Dante's works, the autographs having very early disappeared.

In the case of the Divina Commedia, though an enormous number of manuscripts (about 600) is known to exist, the earliest of them does not come within several years of Dante's death. On the other hand, five early commentaries have come down which were written within twelve years of his

[1] Another curious and perhaps unexplained piece of symbolism occurs in this part of the *Purgatorio* in reference to Statius. It has been noticed that before the fire of purification in Purg. xxvii., Dante walks *behind* Virgil and Statius (xxii. 127); in the passage through the fire he is *between* them (xxvii., 46, 47); afterwards he goes *before* them (xxviii. 82). Here again it is easier to feel sure that (as always in Dante) there is a purpose in this, than to say with any confidence what that purpose is.

death, and it is curious to find various readings occasionally discussed even in some of them. Moreover, there are some cases in which readings which have very little support in manuscripts now existing are supported almost unanimously by the early commentators. This (it may be remarked in passing) illustrates the importance of admitting the evidence of patristic quotations to check the evidence of the surviving manuscripts of the New Testament.

The chief difficulties, however, occur in the case of the Convito, the text of which is deplorably corrupt. Several readings have already been corrected, some with certainty, others with considerable probability, by the help of some of the very numerous direct quotations which abound in this work.

It is obvious that this is a very hazardous process, and one that needs to be employed with the greatest precaution, and only by skilful hands. It would be difficult to imagine any process more uncritical than an offhand alteration of the text of an author simply to secure the accuracy of his quotations. It would assume on his part, either an infallible memory, or else an habitual practice of verifying his references. The latter would be a practical impossibility before the days of printing[1], and it is none too common even in modern authors, with all their facilities for doing it. It would also involve another assumption, sometimes overlooked, viz. that the text then in use was the same as that now current. Further, we must never overlook this fundamental principle that the only errors with which the textual critic has any concern are those which there is good reason to suppose have been introduced *by copyists*. Errors made by the author himself we have no more right to correct than we have to improve his literary style or to bring his scientific or historical knowledge up to date. Some of the tests bearing on this distinction I will speak of presently, but I will first select out of the

[1] This is very well drawn out in reference to the 'habitual looseness and inaccuracy' of early patristic quotations from Scripture by Dr. Sanday in his 'Gospels in the Second Century.' The significant fact is noted that the longest quotations are generally the most accurate, it being then presumably worth while to undertake the labour of verification.

passages discussed later a few which will serve as practical illustrations (*a*) of corrections such as may safely and legitimately be made by the help of a quotation, (*b*) of probable slips of memory on the part of the author himself, which we have no right to meddle with, (*c*) of the need of precaution in respect of possible differences between the text of an author now current and that occurring either in the particular MS. used by Dante, or in the text then generally received.

(*a*) In Conv. IV. xv, Dante quotes in an accurate Italian version a long passage (therefore worth verification, and probably verified) of six consecutive lines from Ovid, Metam. i. 78–83. All goes well till we come to the words 'recens tellus seductaque nuper ab alto Aethere,' and then we find in all manuscripts the surprising reading, 'la recente terra di poco dipartita dal nobile *corpo sottile e diafano*.' It is evident that a marginal gloss has displaced the word 'etera' which puzzled some copyist, and the passage from Ovid enables us with confidence to restore the word. Apparently the copyist knew less about the 'ether' even than modern philosophers (*auct.* Lord Salisbury at the British Association of 1894); for it is most singular that in another passage (Conv. III. xv.) where Dante is quoting another long passage in which the word 'aethera' occurs, viz. Prov. viii. 27–30, all corresponds with the original till we come to 'Quando aethera firmabat sursum et librabat fontes aquarum,' and then the text of the manuscripts runs, 'quando suso fermava e sospendea le fonti dell' acque.' The puzzling word is simply omitted altogether, since the sentence will construe in a fashion without it! (See further, Vulgate, No. 12.)

(*b*) Next as to probable slips of memory on the part of Dante himself. In Conv. I. xii. l. 75, we have a reference given to Nic. Eth., Bk. V., for a quotation which appears to come in fact from Bk. I. We suspect that Dante here gave the reference from memory without verification, probably assuming from the prominence of 'giustizia' in the passage quoted that it was most likely to come from Bk. V. Curiously enough there is a very similar error in Conv. II xv. l. 128, and

one where the occurrence again of the word 'giustizia' suggests a similiar explanation. Clearly, I think, we should not be justified in correcting the text in these cases. In one or two other places in the Convito we have, according to the reading of all known MSS., a reference given to the wrong book of a treatise of Aristotle, or even to a wrong treatise, e.g. in Conv. II. xiv. l. 144, we have a reference to the 1st Book of the Physica of Aristotle (so in all the MSS.) for a passage that actually comes from the Metaphysica [1]. Whether the circumstances here justify our making the correction or not is perhaps open to question. The point is discussed *infra*, under Aristotle, No. 29. But where, as in Conv. III. xiv. l. 98, we have simply the wrong number of a Book given in all MSS. hitherto examined, without any clue as to the origin of the mistake, such errors should, I think, certainly be left to stand, as there is no evidence that they were not due to the author himself [2]. But now contrast with these the erroneous reference in Conv. III. ii. l. 125, to 'Bk. VI.' of the De Anima, for so the MSS. agree in giving it. That we feel sure from the ample knowledge of the De Anima displayed by Dante (see Index) is an absurd blunder which he could not have committed. He must have been aware that there were but three books in the treatise, and when we find this particular passage actually occurring in Bk. III., and further remember how easily III. and VI. might be interchanged from indifferent handwriting, we feel that we may safely make the correction required [3]. One more instance of an inaccuracy in a 'memoriter' quotation occurs in De Mon. III. iii. l. 12, where in referring to the well-known passage from Nic. Eth., Bk. III., that the Lacedemonians are indifferent to the politics of the Scythians, Dante substitutes 'Egyptians' for 'Lacedemonians.'

[1] Mr. Paget Toynbee has pointed out a similar slip in Conv. IV. xxiii. l. 125, where Dante refers to the *De Meteoris* of Albertus Magnus for a quotation which really comes from the *De Iuventute et Senectute* of the same author.

[2] Under Aristotle, No. 61 (Conv. III. xi. l. 12), a case will be found where Giuliani has altered the number of the Book quoted, from an *erroneous* notion of the source of the quotation (!). See also under Virgil, Nos. 35 and 36.

[3] See another similar case under Virgil, No. 34.

(*c*) We will next give an instance of the quotation of a passage where the received text of the author quoted has been rectified since the time of Dante. In the following passage from Purg. xxxiii. 49, the word *Naiade* is most inappropriate (inviting an obvious emendation), and yet is certainly the correct reading:

> 'Ma tosto fien li fatti le Naiade
> Che solveranno questo enigma forte.'

How came Dante, it may be asked, to assign to the Naiads the astonishing function of solving riddles? But any one who refers to a modern edition of Ovid (Metam. vii. 759 *seqq.*) will recognize the passage which Dante is imitating in this line, and, further, in this context generally. But he will also find that it reads thus:

> 'Carmina *Laiades* non intellecta priorum
> Solverat ingeniis.'

The path, and almost the duty, of conjectural emendation seems clearly pointed out. But on further inquiry we find that the reading *Laiades* is due to a manuscript discovered long since Dante's time, and that in his day the text of Ovid in this place was

> 'Carmina *Naiades* non intellecta priorum
> Solvunt ingeniis.'

The received text in Dante is therefore undoubtedly correct in the sense that so it was written by himself, and it is *this*, whether 'for better or worse,' that textual criticism should aim at discovering[1].

Another striking illustration may be given of the caution necessary in dealing with the text of Dante's quotations. In Purg. xxv. 121, the portion of the Church's offices prescribed for use by the penitents in the Cornice of Lust is the beautiful hymn used at matins on Saturday, 'Summae Deus clementiae.' Referring to the Breviary we find the exact form to be 'Summae *Parens* clementiae.' On one of the

[1] See again *inf.* under Lucan, No. 21. Also under St. Augustine, in reference to the quotation of De Doct. Christ. i. 36.

festivals of the Virgin ('Septem Dolorum') there is a hymn beginning 'Summae *Deus* clementiae,' the two hymns being altogether different after the first line. The contents of this latter are wholly inappropriate to the special purgation of this Cornice, while those of the Matins Hymn are most suitable. No doubt, therefore, Dante is referring to this hymn. Hence, say some commentators, he has either intentionally, or inadvertently, substituted *Parens* for *Deus*. The true explanation is that when Pope Urban VIII revised the Breviary in 1631 many of the ancient hymns were retouched and modernized. And, as a matter of fact, *Parens* was substituted *at that revision* for *Deus*. Any one may see the hymn exactly as Dante quotes it, 'Summae *Deus* clementiae,' by referring to any of the ancient 'uses,' e.g. as those of Sarum, Hereford, and York.

Returning now to the need of discrimination between errors of the author himself and those introduced by copyists, it may be well to indicate some other considerations in addition to those already mentioned by which we may be sometimes guided. Among these we may note first that a distinction must be drawn between the words that are important or unimportant in a quotation, either in themselves or for the purpose for which it is adduced. Does the variation occur in what a popular writer would describe as the 'business part' of the quotation, or in the more classic language of Dante himself, the 'pars executiva'? (Epist. x. § 17.) Sometimes the error is one which defeats the author's purpose in making the citations, at other times it does not affect it at all. This obviously has a very important bearing on the legitimacy of correction, since it affords a sort of touchstone to distinguish between the two classes of error which we are considering. At any rate while unimportant variations may be due either to author or copyist, important ones (in the sense first explained) are not likely to have been made by the author, and so may sometimes be more legitimately open to correction by the help of the original passage quoted. Perhaps I might give as an instance the strong case of the introduction (as I should

judge by a copyist) of 'non' into the quotation from a rather obvious reference to Aristotle in Conv. III. viii. l. 18 1, 'la consuetudine [non] è equabile alla natura.' (See Aristotle, No. 58.) Here I will only observe, (1) the omission of 'non' is demanded by the argument of the context; (2) its omission brings the passage into conformity with a familiar *dictum* of Aristotle; (3) its insertion by a copyist is easily accountable, because *prima facie* and apart from the context the statement looks more plausible with 'non.'

The last point touched upon suggests a principle of general applicability, even when the point at issue in the misquotation is not very material. Is the inaccuracy one that can be explained as having arisen from the more correct form upon some recognized principle of what has been termed by Westcott and Hort 'transcriptional probability[1]'? If so, it is, as far as it goes, a reason in favour of its being due to a copyist and therefore within the range of legitimate correction. Or again, is it a question between sense and nonsense? If accidental corruption[2] has made sheer nonsense of a passage, the language of an acknowledged quotation may sometimes fairly be employed within moderate limits for the restoration of an intelligible sense.

A certain number of cases remain in which no definite reason can be traced for the change or departure from the original passage quoted beyond ordinary 'incuria.' But as this may have occurred on the part of the author or of the copyist (with a strong presumption, however, in favour of the latter—'such is the way of them'), we ought still to require, if possible, some definite grounds for supposing the copyist to be at fault before making an alteration in the absence of any MS. evidence on its support. For instance there are changes of single letters, of which sometimes two or three together (such as e, c, and t; f and s (or f); a, e, o; and many others), are scarcely distinguishable in some MSS. Indeed as to these vowels, with some copyists of the Convito, it seems pretty well a matter of chance which they write.

[1] See Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia, *Prolegomena*, p. xxxv. *seqq.*

[2] E.g. the transposition of clauses or lines, errors from ὁμοιοτέλευτα, &c.

At the same time these changes, though slight in themselves, may seriously affect the sense of a quotation, or its rhetorical form, and so come under much the same head as those touching its 'effective part,' as it was just above described. Or again the quotation may chance to be one so extremely familiar and generally known that any variation in its form is not likely to have been made by the author. And as to the copyist, we need not suppose in such cases any intentional change, or an inaccuracy in the quotation as such, but only some careless error in actual writing, against which, as we all unhappily know (even though we may be free from the phenomenal blundering of copyists), 'humana parum cavit natura.' I might give as an instance the correction of 'o' for 'e' in Conv. III. xi. l. 158, discussed under Virgil, No. 34.

These are some of the general considerations that occur to me, but after all each case must be judged a good deal upon its merits, and the various circumstances belonging to it.

In employing quotations for the *interpretation* of the passages in which they occur we are generally on safer ground. But even here we must not forget the possibility of a different sense being intentionally given to a word or words in a passage quoted. For instance in Purg. iii. 138, when Dante says of the excommunicated spirit,

> 'Star gli convien da questa ripa in fuore,' &c.,

we can scarcely doubt that he has in his mind the similar circumstance described of Virgil in Aen. vi. 327 *seqq.*, in reference to the spirits of those whose bodies are unburied :

> 'Nec ripas datur horrendas et rauca fluenta
> Transportare prius, quam sedibus ossa quierunt.'

(The words immediately following, 'Centum errant annos,' are imitated by Dante elsewhere, viz. Inf. xv. 38.) *Ripas* in Virgil refers to the banks or shores of Styx, but *ripa* in Dante cannot refer to the shore of the Island of Purgatory, which these spirits had already reached long ago, but to the steep ascent of the mountain, from the ascent of which they were debarred ; a sense which the word bears often in the Divina Commedia. This is not an important point, or one

where error of intrepretation was likely, but it may serve equally well as a sort of direct illustration of the principle that it would not always be safe to argue that because a passage is quoted or imitated its language is always to be interpreted in the sense of the original.

One obvious case in which quotations may throw light upon interpretation is that of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, which are not uncommon in Dante, and, it may be added, come with suspicious frequency at the end of lines, in spite of his alleged boast that he never altered anything that he wished to say for the sake of a rhyme. If these occur, as they sometimes do, in a quotation or obvious imitation, we can often determine their sense pretty confidently. I will select one or two cases out of several that will be found noticed later. Thus, when Dante says

'Quel fu il duro *camo*
Che dovria l' uom tener dentro a sua meta' (Purg. xiv. 143),

he is evidently thinking of Ps. xxxi. 9: 'In *camo* et freno maxillas eorum constringe'; and so we know that the word thus transliterated into Italian must mean 'a bit.' Also that Dante was familiar with the passage is shown by its direct quotation in De Mon. III. xvi. Again, the disputed interpretation of the word *rimorte* (again a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον) in Purg. xxiv. 4,

'E l' ombre, che parean cose *rimorte*,'

seems really determined for us by the obvious imitation of 'arbores . . . bis mortuae' in Jude 12. But there are also a great many words not uncommon in themselves, but used in an unusual or uncommon sense in Dante, the explanation of which may be traced in the same way. For Dante is said to have qualified the boast above referred to by adding that many times and oft (*molte e spesse volte*) he had made words to express for him that which they had not been in the habit of expressing for others. No student of Dante would feel any difficulty in admitting the truth of this. Thus, in Purg. x. 65, David dancing before the ark is described as 'trescando *alzato*.' The interpretation of the latter word is very much disputed.

It seems most probable that it represents 'accinctus ephod lineo' in 2 Sam. vi. 14, in a narrative which Dante is here imitating throughout[1]. The number of such passages is almost endless[2]. Two more from Ovid may be briefly mentioned. In Purg. xxviii. 50, 51—

'Proserpina nel tempo che perdette
La madre lei, ed ella *primavera*,'

the explanation of *primavera* has been much disputed. It seems most likely that it is to be found in the passage which Dante is imitating from Ovid, Metam. v. 385 *seqq.*, and especially the lines 397–399 :—

'*Matrem* saepius ore
Clamat ; et ut summa vestem laniarat ob ora.
Collecti flores tunicis cecidere remissis.'

In other words, *primavera* means the flowers of spring that she had been gathering ; and so, indeed, Dante uses the word elsewhere—

'[rive] Dipinte di mirabil primavera' (Par. xxx. 63).

But though many similar instances suggest themselves, they will be found discussed later on, and these will suffice as typical illustrations of the practical uses which such quotations may serve. In many cases the best possible commentary on the language in Dante consists in a reference to some passage which he is either quoting or evidently has in his mind. Many instances will be found given later (especially under Aristotle) in which the phraseology or full meaning of passages in Dante cannot be appreciated without such a reference. Another interesting problem to which they lend help is that of the actual Latin translation of Aristotle employed by Dante, but I have treated of this subject in a separate essay.

Apart from the general light thrown by an investigation of this kind upon the studies and methods of working of a typical mediaeval scholar, it seems to me there are some

[1] See further under Vulgate, No. 20.

[2] The two passages from Par. xii., already quoted above (pp. 17, 18), would also illustrate the use of quotations in interpretation.

special applications to which it might be put in reference to the works of Dante himself. First, it might possibly sometimes bear on disputed questions as to the relative dates of composition of his several works. The repetition of the same quotations, or the frequency of quotations occurring from the same author or the same book in two different works, might be taken as at least subsidiary evidence of synchronism of composition. It would afford an indication of the grooves in which the author's thoughts were running at a given time, and would supplement a similar argument derived from coincidences of thought and expression. Unfortunately the difference of subject-matter between two works introduces such a strong disturbing element in the general character of the quotations likely to occur that I fear less can be expected than I at one time hoped from this application of our subject. Take, for example, the Paradiso and the De Monarchia (the date of the latter being one of the most insoluble problems of Dante chronology). I have often been struck with the extraordinary number of little resemblances of thought and expression between these two works, but the difference of subject-matter would preclude any great similarity in the general character of the quotations.

Another and a more promising line of application is this. By comparing the *forms* of quotations occurring in genuine and in doubtful works of the author, or by comparing the interpretation put upon such quotations, or the use made of them (when any peculiar features are presented), we have a sound argument, if judiciously used, for the genuineness or otherwise of the works in dispute. I mean if the resemblances are not too obvious, such as a forger might intentionally devise, but have the appearance of 'undesigned coincidences.' It would be out of place to go into details here. But I have myself been much struck with the argument that may be derived from this consideration in favour of the genuineness of the *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra*. The dispute turns almost entirely on minute considerations of internal evidence; and among others, the similarity in some curious details of the quotations made with those occurring in the genuine works is not to be overlooked. See instances of this

noticed *inf.* under Aristotle, Nos. 11 and 23. I have not had the opportunity of applying such a test to some of the disputed Epistles, but as there again we depend mainly on internal evidence, I think it is probable that the statistics of quotations here collected might be profitably employed. In these cases it is to be remembered that we must be content to 'catch at straws,' since all the available arguments are of a slender kind, but if several agree in pointing in the same direction, their contributory force is not to be neglected.

But there is no doubt that it is in the light thrown upon interpretation that the chief use of such references as these is to be sought. I have often thought that the most generally useful commentary on the Divina Commedia in existence is the invaluable Concordance of Dr. Fay. It best of all enables us to give effect to the cardinal principle insisted on by Giuliani, 'Dante spiegare con Dante.' And it is scarcely less important to interpret him also by the help of those authors whose language and sentiments he is consciously reproducing from time to time by quotation, imitation, or allusion. This enables us to place his own thoughts in their proper and original setting, and to see them as they shaped themselves in his own mind.

It remains to explain the rough classification which I have attempted of the quotations registered under three heads indicated by the letters *a*, *b*, and *c*, intending thereby to distinguish three different degrees (so to speak) of quotation.

(*a*) Cases of direct quotation, either (as in most cases) acknowledged as such with a reference to the author or work quoted, or else so obviously intended to be distinct quotations that a modern writer or editor would undoubtedly insert the usual marks of quotation.

(*b*) Cases where the quotation is not verbally acknowledged, but where the reference to a definite passage of some earlier author is almost equally certain or unmistakable. Under this head are included cases where a passage in Dante has evidently been suggested, either in form or matter, by some Scriptural or classical original, as is constantly the case in respect of historical or mythological details. The source of

these can often be as confidently identified as if there were a verbal quotation, as for instance the reference to Elisha and the fiery chariot of Elijah in Inf. xxvi. 34 *seqq.*, or many stories from the Metamorphoses of Ovid in the Inferno and Purgatorio.

(*c*) This last class includes some cases where the reference is in various degrees probable, but not altogether beyond doubt; and also others where Dante's language is rather that of imitation, adaptation, or allusion, than of actual quotation, though such allusion may sometimes admit of no doubt. But I have always (as I have stated above) avoided including mere 'illustrations,' mere coincidences of thought or expression, unless (in my judgement at any rate) there was reason to suppose that Dante's language was moulded or modified by a reminiscence of the passage to which I have referred. I have endeavoured in doubtful cases to apply this test:—Would Dante's language or thought have been likely to take this precise form, but for the influence exercised on them by the recollections of such and such a passage in Scripture or some classical author? Thus, for example, I have ventured to include a reference to the Laodiceans of Rev. iii. 16 as almost certainly suggesting the idea of Inf. iii. 34 *seqq.*, though there is no formal reference or quotation.

I do not attach much importance to this classification, since opinions would often differ as to the proper letter to be assigned, and I have often hesitated myself. But I have thought it might sometimes be of use, and it can at any rate do no harm.

In the great majority of instances the parallel passages are simply registered in the Index, and may be left to speak for themselves. In the case of those selected for discussion some point of interest seemed to be involved, such as the bearing on the form or the interpretation of the text of Dante, or various other matters to which it seemed worth while to call attention from time to time. The passages so discussed are in the first Index arranged under the authors from whom the quotations are taken, with a few general preliminary observations when necessary as to Dante's use of the author in question.

Under each author different principles of grouping have been adopted as seemed most convenient in each case, so as to keep together passages having some common point of connexion or of interest. The order, however, is not of much consequence, since references are given in the Index to the pages where each passage will be found.

I now proceed to speak separately of Dante's treatment of the principal authors from whom he quotes, and to discuss the passages which seem to me to call for some special comment under each author. We commence with

THE VULGATE.

It is important to remember that in this version only were the writings either of the Old or New Testament known to Dante, because the references occasionally cease to be appropriate at all when compared with the reading or rendering of our Authorized Version [1]. Also the division of the verses, especially in the Apocrypha and sometimes in the Psalms, is different. I have already observed that Dante's language is full of Scriptural phraseology, even when definite quotation is not in question. And it is scarcely necessary to add that his reverence for the authority of Scripture is unbounded, and any statement therein found, either directly, or as transformed by the strange processes of allegorical interpretation and application then universally recognized as valid [2], is for him an absolute final and self-sufficient warrant for any point with which it deals. The following passages out of many others will be sufficient to illustrate this:—Par. v. 76; xix. 82–4; xxiv. 91–102, 133–8; Conv. II. ix. ll. 113 *seqq.*; De Mon. III. iv. ll. 81–91, &c.

I will first take together a few quotations which seem to be

[1] These are some instances among the passages discussed or indexed:—Inf. xxxi. 10; Purg. x. 58; xi. 116; xvii. 26; Par. xi. 53; xxix. 28–30; Conv. II. vi. l. 34, &c. Also one of the stock passages by which the central position of Jerusalem was proved by mediaeval writers—'Deus . . . operatus est salutem in medio terrae,' Ps. lxxiii. 12—is quite different in E. V. See Ps. lxxiv. 13.

[2] See Conv. II. i.; Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 85–111; xxii. ll. 145 *seqq.*; De Mon. I. xv. ll. 19–24; II. xviii.; III. ix. *ad fin.* &c.

available for purposes of textual criticism, then some that bear upon the interpretation of the passages in which they occur, and afterwards those which offer other various points of interest. In a very few cases no reference will be found in the index to a passage that is discussed. This is either because the tendency of the discussion is to show that the reference is wrongly assumed, or else because, though some reference is implied, it is too general to be entered against any one particular passage in the original author.

(1)

Inf. i. 61.] Mentre ch' io *rovinava* in basso loco.

Here we have the various readings *rovinava* (or *ruinava*), *ritornava*, and *rimirava*. Apart from other considerations, such as the greater vigour and picturesqueness of the first of these words, and its use again in allusion to this same scene in Par. xxxii. 138, and to a similar one in Inf. xx. 35, it is also strongly supported by a reference to Prov. iv. 19, 'Via impiorum tenebrosa, nesciunt ubi corruunt.' This passage is directly quoted in Conv. IV. vii. ll. 98 *seqq.*, and it being of course translated, the last words appear as 'non sanno dove *rovinano*,' 'They know not at what they *stumble*' (E. V.). The word then here means, 'While I was blundering or stumbling in the valley.' The contrast of the joyous and bright mountain in the previous lines, and again in ll. 77, 78, may well be compared with preceding verse in Proverbs, 'Justorum autem semita quasi lux splendens procedit, et crescit usque ad perfectam diem.' Thus, while this cannot be registered exactly as a 'quotation,' yet the comparison together of the several passages which I have given seems fairly to throw light on the question of the reading.

(2)

Purg. vi. 109.] Vedi *la pressura*
De' tuoi gentili.

The reading *pressura* is much better supported than *oppressura*, which is both a very obvious word in itself and also may easily have arisen from a misunderstanding of *lapressura*.

But besides, the reading *pressura* is made almost certain by its use exactly in this sense in St. Luke xxi. 25, 'pressura gentium,' 'distress of nations.' (Even the word *gentium* seems echoed in *gentili*.) The word occurs also in St. John xvi. 33, 'In mundo pressuram habebitis.' Also in De Mon. III. ix. l. 48, Dante uses the word again in evident allusion to these passages. A quotation of one of our Lord's last warnings to the disciples is explained, 'hoc etiam dicebat praemonens eos *pressuram* futuram.'

(3)

Purg. x. 120. Già scorger puoi come ciascun si *picchia.*

Here not only is there another reading *nicchia* (less well supported), but also commentators give several different explanations of *picchia* (see Scart. note *h. l.*). But both the reading and interpretation seem to be fixed by the obvious reference to the publican in St. Luke xviii. 13, 'Publicanus . . . . nolebat nec oculos ad coelum levare sed *percutiebat* pectus suum,' &c. His attitude is reproduced in l. 116 (a terra li rannicchia), and his action in the words above quoted. The propriety of this is further enhanced when we remember that it is pride which is here being expiated by all the conditions of the most profound humility.

(4)

Purg. xiv. 133. Anciderammi qualunque *m' apprende.*

This evidently represents Gen. iv. 14, 'Omnis igitur qui invenerit me, occidet me.' We cannot therefore doubt that the reading (also better supported) *m' apprende* is to be preferred to *mi prende*, which would convey quite a different meaning.

(5)

Purg. xxiv. 126. Quando ver Madian *discese* i colli.

The reading *distese* is so clearly a mere copyist's blunder for *discese* that it is hardly worth while (except as showing Dante's graphic recollection of the original) to notice that the latter is evidently required by the passage in Judges which is referred to. In chap. vii. 8, 9, we read 'Castra autem Madian erant *subter in valle.* Eadem nocte dixit

Dominus ad eum : Surge et *descende* in castra,' &c.; and the word *descendat* occurs again in both of the following verses.

(6)

Par. vii. 39. Da via di verità e da sua vita.

Here it has been proposed to read 'Da via, da verità, e da sua vita' in order to assimilate the line to the familiar words of our Lord in St. John xiv. 6, 'Ego sum via et veritas et vita.' But as the manuscript evidence strongly preponderates for the former reading, and as the natural tendency of scribes is rather to *introduce* uniformity or symmetry of expression than to *break* it (so that in fact the latter would be in some sense a *facilior lectio*), the argument from apparent quotation is scarcely strong enough to justify an alteration of the common text.

(7)

Par. xxii. 94.

See the discussion of this passage in my *Textual Criticism*, &c. (p. 475) for the bearing of the undoubted reference to Ps. cxiii. (cxiv.) 5, both on the reading and interpretation.

(8)

Par. xxviii. 92, 93. Che il numero loro
Più che il doppiar degli scacchi s' immilla.

I must not omit to mention a rather comical variant here, and one which is still more comically defended by a supposed Scripture reference. Dante is comparing the innumerable hosts of angels to the number formed by the doubling in geometrical progression of the number of the chessmen, i. e. of the numbers from 1 to 64, the same problem with which we are familiar as applied to horse-shoe nails. The somewhat uncommon word *scacchi* has been changed by some copyist, after the common fashion, into a word which was (appropriately enough) more familiar to him—*sciocchi*, i. e. fools. Still more strangely this has been adopted in the Aldine and other editions, and solemnly defended by a commentator so generally sensible as Daniello da Lucca by a citation of Eccles. i. 15, 'Stultorum infinitus est numerus'! Imagine the absurdity of Dante describing the 'innumerable company

of angels' as being twice as many as there are fools in the world, i. e. twice infinity! And apart from the absurdity of such a supposition, notice its flat contradiction with the express statement in Par. xxix. 134, 135, that the number of the angels, though in one sense 'innumerable,' is yet limited and determinate—

Vedrai che in sue migliaia
Determinato numero si cela.

We turn now to passages bearing on the text of the Convito, which is very corrupt, and it is here that we chiefly welcome any help from the forms of quotations, or indeed from any other quarter.

(9)

Conv. I. xi. 1. 30 seqq. Però è scritto che 'il cieco al cieco farà guida, e così cadranno amendue nella fossa.'

This is the reading supported by the MSS. generally. It is tempting to alter it into '*se* 'l cieco al cieco farà guida, così,' &c., as some editors have done, whom I was at first inclined to follow, especially as my own MS. and another (generally a good one) cited by Giuliani read *se*. This *prima facie* seems more natural, since it accords better with the passage quoted, viz. St. Matt. xv. 14, 'Caeci sunt, et duces caecorum, caecus autem si caeco ducatum praestet, ambo in foveam cadunt.' But in the case of a passage so familiar, such an argument should be very cautiously employed, especially against the preponderance of manuscript evidence, as it cannot be disguised that this reading has distinctly the character of a *lectio facilior*. Still more is such caution needed if the origin of the other reading can be reasonably explained. We observe then, that (1) the word *così* would suit a preceding assertion rather better than a supposition. (2) The word *e* before *così* seems well established by manuscript authority, since it is found even in those which have *se* preceding, with which it is indeed inconsistent. (3) Next it may be observed that the original passage in St. Matthew does contain both an assertion and also a supposition in which the language of the assertion is repeated, and the repetition would be quite

correctly given in an abbreviated form by the word *così*[1]. (4) In the *Vetus Itala* and other ancient Latin versions, the earlier part of the verse reads, 'caeci sunt duces caecorum' (omitting the word 'et'), and in this form the passage is quoted by St. Augustine and St. Cyprian, *auct.* Sabatier *h. l.*, though I have not been able to verify this myself. Further, these words are ambiguous: they may either mean 'They be blind leaders of the blind' (as E.V.) or 'The blind are leaders of the blind', and from this to the form in the text, 'il cieco al cieco farà guida,' the transition would be easy enough in a quotation from memory, especially if the text in the form said to be found in St. Augustine happened to be familiar to Dante[2]. On the whole then, though not without hesitation, I am inclined to stand by the *prima facie* more difficult form of the quotation which is found in the majority of MSS.

(10)

Conv. II. vi. l. 103. I cieli narrano la gloria di Dio, e l' opere delle sue mani *annunzia* lo firmamento.

It is hardly necessary to quote the citation of Ps. xviii. 2, 'opera manuum ejus annuntiat firmamentum,' to correct the absurd reading of nearly all MSS. *h. l.*, '*annunziano* lo firmamento.' The change was probably made by an early copyist for the sake of the superficially more complete antithesis with the previous clause.

(11)

Conv. III. viii. l. 14. La Sapienza di Dio, *precedente* tutte le cose, chi cercava?'

This is an exact quotation of Ecclus. i. 3, 'Sapientiam Dei praecedentem omnia quis investigavit?' We therefore have no hesitation in altering the word *precedette*, which is given by the MSS., into *precedente*, from which it differs very slightly. This indeed the sense of the passage would also demand.

[1] Thus, 'caeci sunt [et] duces caecorum' = 'il cieco al cieco farà guida'; and 'caecus autem si caeco ducatum praestet' = 'e così.'

[2] That Dante was sometimes influenced by the exegesis of St. Augustine seems probable from what is said *infr.* under Nos. 38 and 46.

(12)

Prov. viii. 27–30.] **Conv. III. xv. ll. 167 seqq.**

Here we have a long quotation which is accurately followed in Dante's translation for several lines, but when we come to the words in v. 28, '*quando aethera firmabat sursum*,' in all the MSS. (as reported) the word *aethera* is omitted, and we find only the words '*quando suso fermava*.' The sentence will, as a matter of fact, construe without it, though rather tamely; but as it is not likely that Dante, in an almost *verbatim* quotation, would have omitted this somewhat prominent word, we may, I think, certainly replace it in the text. We are confirmed in this in a very singular manner—for I am far from supposing that we may always thus rectify the text on the assumption of the accuracy of quotations—by another similar case in Conv. IV. xv. l. 80 *seqq.*, where this same word *etera* in another long and accurate quotation has been replaced by an obvious marginal gloss, as is explained under Ovid, No. 17, and also *supra* p. 36. The word *etera* was evidently a puzzle to the copyists. Also this ostrich-like method of avoiding a difficulty by merely omitting a troublesome word is practised elsewhere by copyists. For instance, in my MS. of the Convito the words 'd' un torchio' in III. v. l. 150, are simply omitted. A very similar case is mentioned by Mr. Rendel Harris in his interesting monograph on the Codex Bezae (p. 262). In the Latin Version of St. Luke xix. 37 the following variants are found, (1) 'multitudo discipulorum,' (2) 'm. discentium,' (3) 'm. descendentium.' The last is an obvious corruption, partly perhaps suggested by *descensum* in the previous line. Now it is curious that some MSS. leave the word blank. This may be taken as a proof that their originals had the difficult word *descendentium*, which the copyists simply omitted as unintelligible.

(13)

Conv. IV. vi. ll. 174 seqq. Guai a te, terra, lo cui re è fanciullo, e li cui principi *da mane* mangiano . . . Beata la terra lo cui re è nobile, e li cui principi *cibano* in suo tempo.

The long quotation here from Eccles. x. 16, 17 enables us to correct, as I think, with tolerable certainty two false readings in the MSS., and, I believe, in all the MSS. hitherto examined.

In the first place we have 'li cui principi *la domane* mangiano,' representing the words 'cujus principes mane comedunt.' Dante probably wrote *da mane*, which exactly expresses the adverbial sense of the Latin *mane*, and which occurs also at Par. xxvii. 29 in the phrase 'da sera e da mane.' Then '*damane*' was probably mistaken by a copyist for '*domane*,' and the article *la* supplied, so that the origin of the common reading '*la domane*' is easily explained.

Next we have, two lines below, and again I believe in all MSS., 'li cui principi *usano il suo tempo*.' Now this affords a very lame antithesis to '*da mane mangiano*,' and moreover does not correspond with the words in the original, which are 'vescuntur in tempore suo.' I think then that we should certainly read '*cibano in* suo tempo,' especially when we recollect how very slight the difference in MSS. would be between *ufano* and *cibano*, *u* and *ci* often scarcely differing except in the precarious dot to the 'i.'

(14)

Conv. IV. vii. l. 131. Quegli *morrà* chè non ebbe disciplina, e nella moltitudine della sua stoltizia sarà ingannato.

The MSS. here read *more* or *muore*. But when we observe how closely the quotation follows the original in Prov. v. 23, 'Ipse morietur quia non habuit disciplinam, et in multitudine stultitiae suae decipietur,' we confidently substitute the future *morrà*, noting also how slight the difference would be between *morrà* and *mora* (the form in which it would be often represented in MSS), and how naturally *mora* would then be altered into *more*. The antithesis required to the future *sarà* points of course in the same direction. Most editions have *che* after *morrà*, but this should evidently be *chè* (=*quia* in the original), a difference which would be lost in most MSS.

(15)

Conv. IV. xv. ll. 137 seqq. Vedesti l' uomo ratto a rispondere? di lui stoltezza, più che correzione, è da *sperare*.

Here 'è da *sperare*' may unhesitatingly be substituted for what is said to be the reading of all MSS., 'è da *sapere*,' from a comparison with the original in Prov. xxix. 20, which reads

thus—'Vidisti hominem velocem ad loquendum? stultitia magis speranda est quam ejus correptio.' The manuscript reading is a mere copyist's blunder.

It will be observed that the E. V. is different here. It follows a reading given by Sabatier *h.l.* as that of the *Versio Antiqua*, 'quia spem habet magis insipiens quam ille.'

(16)

Conv. IV. xxiv. ll. 145 seqq. Non ti possano *lattare* di lusinghe nè di diletto li peccatori, che tu vadi con loro.

The word *lattare* or *allattare* must certainly be substituted here for the almost meaningless *quel fare* presented by the MSS. Some copyist probably inserted this pointless expression because he did not understand the singular metaphor of *lattare*, having probably forgotten its occurrence in the passage quoted. This is as follows :—'Fili mi, si te lactaverint peccatores, ne acquiescas eis' (Prov. i. 10). The last phrase in Dante's quotation seems to be borrowed from v. 15, 'Fili mi ne ambules cum eis.' I rather prefer *lattare* to *allattare* (Giuliani) partly because it is the actual word in Proverbs *l.c.*, and partly because Dante himself uses the word in Purg. xxii. 102, though it is true in a different metaphor. A correction of this kind is specially interesting because, without the clue of the quotation, this particular correction of *quel fare*, even if it had suggested itself as a conjecture, could scarcely have been justified; yet we cannot doubt that this is what Dante wrote.

(17)

Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 74. Siccome dice nostro Signore, 'A grado ricevo, se a grado è dato.'

This is a very singular citation of, apparently, St. Matt. x. 8, 'gratis accepistis gratis date.' As I do not find any variation here either in the MSS. or in the patristic citations of the passage, I cannot offer any explanation of the form of words here adopted. If they are correctly given, the lesson would seem rather to be that of other passages of Scripture, such as 'God loveth a cheerful giver,' or the acceptance by Christ of the cup of cold water given to a disciple as though it were given to Himself; yet Dante can scarcely be thinking of any other passage than that in St. Matthew,

since the words are used by our Lord precisely with the same application as here, viz. a reference to healing the sick and other such acts of kindness. Still, difficult as the question is, I do not feel that we are quite justified in simply altering the text, as Giuliani does, to bring it into accordance with the words quoted. Thus he reads 'A grado ricevete, a grado date.' Such a solution is no doubt tempting.

(18)

Conv. IV. xxx. l. 66. Chiamandola (*sc.* Nobiltà) amica di quella (*sc.* Filosofia), la cui propria *magione* (al. *ragione*) è nel secretissimo della divina Mente.

There can, I think, be no hesitation as to the correctness of the ingenious suggestion of Mr. Lowell, that for *ragione* (which is found in all MSS.) we should read *magione*. Dante no doubt had in his mind such passages as Wisd. viii. 3, where the writer says of Wisdom, '*contubernium* habens Dei'; and ix. 9, 'Et tecum sapientia tua quae novit opera tua, quae et affuit tunc cum orbem terrarum faceres,' &c. These and similar passages we know from other quotations to have been familiar to Dante (see Index), and what more fitting conclusion to all that he has said in praise of Philosophy in the Convito than that he should declare her abode to be in the inmost heart of God? The words *ragione* and *magione* differ very slightly; the latter is rather an uncommon word, the former not only very common, but also rather tempting here from its natural association with Wisdom or Philosophy.

Next follow some quotations bearing on the *interpretation* of the passages in which they occur. In some of these cases there is no actual quotation, but a probable or supposed reference to certain passages in Scripture has been used as an argument for the interpretation of the language of Dante.

(19)

Inf. iv. 57, 58. Di Moisè legista e ubbidiente;
Abraam patriarca, e David re.

It has been proposed to alter the received punctuation (and by consequence the meaning) of this passage thus:—

Di Moisè legista, e ubbidiente
Abraam patriarca, e David re.

And this chiefly on the plausible ground that *obedience* is emphasized in Scripture as a distinguishing feature in Abraham's character more markedly than in that of Moses. See especially Gen. xxvi. 4, 5, where the blessing of Abraham is specially connected with his obedience, 'Eo quod *obedierit* Abraham voci meae et custodierit praecepta et mandata mea.' So again Heb. xi. 8, 'Fide qui vocatur Abraham *obedivit* in locum exire,' &c.

The argument, it must be confessed, is an ingenious and attractive one, but in this particular case it seems outweighed by the injury which the alteration would cause to the balance and rhythm of both the lines involved, and by its removal of any pause or break whatever between two *terzine*, which, though not wholly unprecedented is extremely rare. (See further *Textual Criticism*, &c. p. 27.)

(20)

Purg. x. 64, 65. Lì precedeva al benedetto vaso,
Trescando *alzato*, l' umile Salmista.

The interpretation of the word *alzato* here is much disputed; but since *trescando alzato* seems evidently to represent 'David *saltabat* totis viribus . . . . *accinctus* ephod lineo' in 2 Sam. vi. 14, the meaning appears to be 'with his garments girt up high[1].' See later in v. 20, where Michal upbraids David as 'discoperiens se,' and as 'nudatus' like a 'scurra,' in which sense he appeared as 'men che re,' in the language of Dante in the next line. We may compare Horace's well-known metaphor *Altius praecinctis*, to denote activity, in Sat. I. v. 5. Also I have met with an interesting parallel to this use of *alzato* in the Prediche di Fra Giordano quoted in the *Vocab. Tramater.* These sermons were preached 1300–1306, so that he is an exact contemporary of Dante. He describes the first Passover Feast in Egypt thus:—'Mangiarono l' agnello, e l' pane azzimo, *stando alzati* col bastone in mano.' The meaning of these words is most likely determined by the correspondence

[1] Indeed *trescare* itself='saltare totis viribus,' as Scart. observes. Several commentators grotesquely refer *alzato* to the 'high action' displayed by David! They would seem to attribute to him something of the undignified agility of a Hippocleides (see Herod. vi. 129, τοῖσι σκέλεσι χειρονομήσαντα).

with Exod. xii. 11, 'Sic autem comedetis illum: *Renes vestros accingetis*, et calceamenta habebitis in pedibus, tenentes baculos in manibus.' This strongly supports the interpretation for *alzato* in Dante *l. c.*

Then there is probably another interesting parallel in Dante himself which I do not think has been noticed. In Par. xxi. 130, where Dante is satirizing the lazy and corpulent cardinals of his own day, he says:—

> Or voglion quinci e quindi chi rincalzi
> Li moderni pastori, e chi li meni,
> Tanto son gravi, e chi diretro gli *alzi.*

This last word is generally explained 'support them behind,' to enable them to mount their horses or carriages. I think it is more probable that the word means 'lift their trains behind them.' The preposterous dimensions of their garments form the subject of the words immediately following. They are so large as to cover their horses as well as themselves, so that two beasts (the horse and the cardinal) go under one covering[1]. I am informed that in colloquial Italian the command 'alzati' would be addressed to a person as the equivalent to 'lift your dress.' Hence I think we should probably give this signification to the word in Par. xxi. 132, as well as in the passage under discussion.

(21)

Purg. xxxi. 46. Pon giù il seme del piangere.

Though various and some rather fanciful explanations of this expression have been suggested, it seems most likely that it is only an 'echo' or reminiscence of Ps. cxxv. 5, 'Qui seminant in lacrimis.' Beatrice bids Dante to 'lay aside this sowing of tears,' the familiar ring of the words being effective in itself, though their exact form and also their meaning is changed.

[1] Benvenuto has a very caustic and quaint comment upon this passage. '*Sì che due bestie van sott' una pelle*'—scilicet bestia portans et ipse portatus, qui verius est bestia et bestialior ipsa bestia. Et certe si autor revivisceret hodie, posset mutare literam istam et dicere: *Sì che* tre *bestie van sott' una pelle*; scilicet Cardinalis, meretrix, et equus; sicut audivi de uno quem bene novi, qui portabat concubinam suam ad venationem post se in clune equi vel muli; et ipse vere erat sicut equus et mulus sine ratione.'

(22)

Purg. xii. 58-60. Mostrava come in rotta si fuggiro
Gli Assiri, poi che fu morto Oloferne,
Ed anche le *reliquie del martiro.*

The meaning of the words italicized has been differently given, but there can be little doubt, if we refer to the original in Judith xiv., that they refer to the headless trunk of Holofernes. The chapter contains a circumstantial account of the visit of the Assyrian chiefs to the tent, and how Bagoas, having lifted the curtain after some hesitation, saw 'cadaver absque capite Holofernis in suo sanguine tabefactum jacere super terram' (v. 14). He then goes forth and repeats to the people, 'Ecce Holofernes jacet in terra et caput ejus non est in illo' (v. 16). Then follows 'intolerabilis timor et tremor' (v. 17), and the panic-stricken flight depicted by Dante in the first of these lines. The prominent part played by the headless trunk in the graphic narrative leaves no doubt, I think, that this is intended by 'reliquie del martiro,' rather than the slain Assyrians, or the head of Holofernes hanging upon the walls (Judith xiv. 1), one or other of which interpretations is found in most of the early commentaries.

(23)

Purg. xiv. 143. Quel fu il duro *camo*
Che dovria l' uom tener dentro a sua meta.

The ἅπαξ λεγόμενον *camo*, which supplies a convenient rhyme, is doubtless borrowed by Dante from Ps. xxxi. 9, 'In *camo* et freno maxillas eorum constringe,' and this reference, as well as the requirements of the context, leave no doubt that it means 'bit' or 'curb.' This is further confirmed when we note that 'Quel fu il duro camo' refers back to xiii. 40,

Lo *fren* vuol esser del contrario suono.

And a few lines below in the present passage, l. 147, Dante refers to the failure of any '*freno* o richiamo' in this life as necessitating such discipline hereafter. The quotation of this verse of the Psalms in De Mon. III. xvi. l. 74, shows Dante to have been familiar with it.

(24)

Purg. xxiv. 4. E l' ombre che parean cose *rimorte.*

The word *rimorte* is again, I believe, a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, and has its meaning assuredly determined by the reminiscence of Jude 12, 'arbores . . . . infructuosae, *bis mortuae.*'

(25)

Par. vii. 3. Felices ignes horum *malachoth.*

Dante was acquainted with Jerome's *Praefationes* to the Vulgate. He definitely quotes this 'proemio della Bibbia' in Conv. IV. v. l. 143, employing the reverential language of St. Jerome towards St. Paul to express his own feelings towards Cato ('meglio è tacere che poco dire'). This being so, there can be little doubt that this was the source from which Dante derived the Hebrew word 'malachoth,' which is so curiously introduced in the above passage. St. Jerome says, 'Quartus *Melachim* id est Regum . . . . meliusque multo est *Melachim*, id est Regum, quam *Malachoth*, id est Regnorum dicere.' Scartazzini observes that *Malachoth* is the common reading, though *Mamlachoth* would be the correct Hebrew. There is no reason to suppose that Dante had any independent knowledge of Hebrew[1], but this passage, as he found it, supplied him with a word that suited his rhyme, and also provided the interpretation which gave exactly the required meaning, viz. 'horum regnorum.'

(26)

Purg. xxviii. 32, 33. Sotto l' ombra perpetua, che mai
Raggiar non lascia sole ivi, nè luna.

The probable Scriptural reference in the latter line will guide us, I think, to the right interpretation of this passage. It certainly seems to me that Scartazzini's references to Rev. xxi. 23 and other passages in which the absence of the

[1] Indeed he very quaintly acknowledges his ignorance of it in Par. xii. 80, 81,

'O madre sua veramente Giovanna,
Se interpretata val come si dice.

Either St. Jerome, who interprets Johanna, 'Domini gratia' (on St. Matt. xvi. 17), and suggests that, Barjona perhaps stands for Barjohanna; or possibly Aquinas, who closely reproduces the passage from St. Jerome (on St. John i.), may have been the source of Dante's information in this case.

sun and moon in heaven is spoken of, are wholly and strangely out of place here. First, this is not heaven, but the Earthly Paradise, where assuredly Scripture does not imply the absence of sun and moon, but quite the reverse. Next, what could be the meaning of 'Raggiar *non lascia*' in that case? It surely implies the shining of sun and moon in the sky, but that their rays are excluded from the stream of Lethe by the thickness of the overhanging forest. Also, *non lascia* seems to suggest the idea of protection from something that might 'hurt or annoy,' the whole spirit of this exquisite description being that of rest and peace and security. Hence I feel strongly convinced that the idea is suggested, and consequently the interpretation of the passage governed, by Ps. cxx. 6, 'Per diem sol non uret te, neque luna per noctem.'

(27)

Purg. xi. 4–6. Laudato sia il tuo nome e il tuo valore
Da ogni creatura, com' è degno
Di render grazie al tuo dolce *vapore*.

The curious expression 'tuo dolce *vapore*' has given rise to much variety of interpretation. The old commentators generally agree that Dante alludes in this *terzina* to the mystery of the three Persons of the Trinity under their several attributes of *valore*, *nome* and, *vapore*. I say 'attributes,' because they generally explain *valore* as representing the *Power* of the Father[1], and *nome* as the *Wisdom* of the Son, while to bring *vapore* into connexion with the Spirit, it is paraphrased as *gratia* by *Benv. Land;* as *amore* by *Vell. Dan.;* as *benivolenzia* by *Buti*. It appears to me, on the strength of the probable reference to Wisd. vii. 25, that *vapore* stands for *sapientia*. The passage referred to contains an elaborate description of *Wisdom*, in which she is represented (*inter alia*) as 'Vapor virtutis Dei.' Also, besides the epithet *suavis* in verse 22 (cf. *dolce, h. l.*), we have the expression in ch. viii. 1 'disponit omnia *suaviter*.' If it is thought necessary

[1] It is perhaps worth noting that in Par. xxvi. 42, *valore* is distinctly used for the *goodness* of God in contrast with His *glory* in reference to Exod. xxxiii. 18, 19. This in fact seems to be its usual sense in Dante.

to maintain the reference to the Trinity at all, *nome*, of which *sapientia* seems rather a forced paraphrase, might rather perhaps be connected with the idea of the Λόγος. Since however this passage is intended as a paraphrase of the words 'Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy name,' and as these are addressed directly to the First Person of the Trinity, and as *nome* has its obvious counterpart in the words paraphrased, I do not think the reference to the doctrine of the Trinity is appropriate here. All these attributes may of course be applied to God the Father. But the probability of the reference to the passage of Wisdom is independent of this detail of interpretation.

(28)

Par. v. 66. Come Jeptè alla sua prima mancia.

This difficult line seems to be explained by a reference to the precise language of Judges xi. 31 (as Scart. points out). The commentators, ancient and modern, have been driven to various far-fetched explanations of *mancia* to adapt it to the epithet *prima*. In truth the epithet fits it rather awkwardly. Jephthah's vow was not a 'first gift,' but the gift of the first object that he might meet, and it would probably never have occurred to Dante to express the idea in this compressed form but from a recollection of the actual language of the Vulgate, 'Quicunque *primus* fuerit egressus . . . . *offeram* Domino.'

(29)

Par. ix. 122, 123. Dell' alta vittoria
Che s' acquistò con l' una e l' altra palma.

Dante here says that Rahab was the firstfruits in glory of the triumph of Christ, and he adds that it was well that such a palm or trophy should be found in heaven of the lofty victory that was gained by the uplifting of one and the other hand, because she forwarded the first glory gained by Joshua in the Holy Land, i.e. of course, the capture of Jericho. The interpretation is very much disputed. Does this victory gained by the uplifted hands refer to what goes before or to what follows? In the former case the uplifted hands will be those of Christ on the cross, in the latter those of Joshua,

Dante remembering the panegyric pronounced upon him in Ecclus. xlvi. 1 *seqq.*, and especially verse 3, 'Quam gloriam adeptus est *in tollendo manus suas*,' i.e. by the power of prayer. This was most remarkably the case in respect of the capture of Jericho, the 'prima gloria' here mentioned by Dante. We should naturally compare with this metaphor the incident in Exod. xvii. 10–13, where the hands of Moses were stayed up by Aaron and Hur till Joshua's victory over the Amalekites was complete. Scartazzini contends strongly for the reference to Joshua, as against the view generally held; and certainly he remarks that Rahab was in no special or exceptional sense a trophy of Christ's victory, as she was of that of Joshua. But in ll. 119, 120 Dante has actually declared her to have been 'a kind of firstfruits' of Christ's victory, and by that statement we must be guided here. It must indeed be admitted that 'duplices tendens ad sidera palmas' is a most familiar description of the act of prayer. Still, I cannot doubt myself that the reference to Christ and not Joshua is the correct one.

(30)

Par. xi. 32, 33. ad alte grida
Disposò lei col sangue benedetto.

It would be hardly worth while pointing out the passing yet obvious reference to Matt. xxvii. 46, 50 ('Clamavit Jesus voce magna . . . . iterum clamans voce magna'), or to the parallel passages in SS. Mark and Luke, except that some old commentators (Pietro di Dante, and to some extent Benvenuto) have explained the 'alte grida' to refer to the cries of the Jews, 'Crucify Him! Crucify Him!' The reference given above, especially when taken in connexion (as Scart. points out) with the idea expressed in Acts xx. 28 ('Ecclesiam Dei quam acquisivit sanguine suo') leaves no doubt, I think, as to the true interpretation of the passage.

(31)

Par. xi. 53, 54. Non dica Ascesi, che direbbe corto,
Ma Oriente, se proprio dir vuole.

There is no doubt primarily, as Mr. Butler observes, a play on the words 'Ascesi' (as if from 'ascendere') and

'Oriente.' The meaning beyond this to be attributed to 'Oriente' is, I think, determined by St. Luke i. 78, 'visitavit nos *Oriens* ex alto,' 'the dayspring from on high hath visited us.' This continues the metaphor of l. 50, 'nacque al mondo un sole,' and moreover the expression would be specially familiar to a reader of the Vulgate, as it occurs in two well-known prophecies of Zechariah iii. 8 and vi. 12, 'Servum meum Orientem,' 'Oriens nomen ejus'—in both which cases our version has 'the Branch.'

(32)

Par. xii. 128, 129. nei grandi offici
Sempre posposi la sinistra cura.

These words of St. Bonaventura constitute rather 'a dark saying.' The most probable explanation is (as I have already noted, *sup.* p. 17) that Dante is alluding to Prov. iii. 16, where Wisdom is described as holding 'in her left hand riches and honour,' '*in sinistra ejus divitiae et gloria*,' and that he assumes sufficient familiarity with this, as elsewhere with other passages of Scripture, on the part of his readers to make the allusion intelligible without further explanation. This could scarcely be supposed to be the case with a passage, otherwise most apposite, from St. Thomas Aquinas (quoted by Scart. and others) as possibly the original source of the reference or question. Unless indeed it might perhaps be argued that it is a delicate compliment to assume this in the presence of St. Thomas, and that in return for his courtesy to St. Francis (see ll. 110, and 143, 144) St. Bonaventura makes such an allusion. But the former explanation appears to me more probable, and moreover there is just such another allusive reference a few lines before to 'the counsel of perfection' given by Christ to the rich young man. See ll. 74, 75[1]. In any case, the portion of the Book of Proverbs referring to Wisdom was very familiar to Dante himself, and is frequently quoted in the Convito.

[1] Similarly Par. xxv. 121–126 depends for its intelligibility upon our assumed familiarity with John xxi. 22, 23 and the traditional misunderstanding of our Lord's words in that passage. Another case occurs in Par. xxxii. 70–72. See *infra* No. 33.

(33)

Par. xxxii. 70–72. Però, secondo il color dei capelli
Di cotal grazia, l' altissimo lume
Degnamente convien che s' incappelli.

Compare with this Gen. xxv. 22–25, esp. ver. 25, 'Qui prior egressus est, rufus erat, et totus in morem pellis, hispidus.' Dante's startling and rather crude metaphor has evidently been suggested by the passage of Genesis cited above, since it comes in immediate connexion with the reference to the incident respecting Esau and Jacob narrated in the same passage. Dante's argument here is that God imparts grace to His creatures entirely according to His own free will (ll. 64–66); and that in direct proportion to the amount of that grace is the degree of glory which follows (ll. 66 and 70–72). Further it is under the guidance of Rom. ix. 10–13 that Esau and Jacob are thus cited as typical illustrations of God's predestinative choice of individuals apart from any merits or demerits of conduct (ll. 67–69). The phrase *secondo il color dei cappelli di cotal grazia* would be quite unmeaning to any one who did not recognize the allusion to the above passage in Genesis. To this we might add ch. xxvii. 11, 'Esau my brother is a hairy man, and I am a smooth man.' Hence this allusion is interesting as one of those in which Dante assumes or presupposes in his readers that intimate familiarity with Scripture which he himself possessed. This has been noted in several other cases. See Introd. pp. 17, 18.

(34)

Purg. xxxi. 62, 63. Ma dinanzi dagli occhi dei pennuti
Rete si spiega indarno.

This is a simple translation of Prov. i. 17, 'Frustra autem jacitur rete ante oculos pennatorum,' which sufficiently explains the metaphor of *pennuti*. This passage is again employed by Dante in the way of allusion rather than direct quotation in Epist. vi. § 5, where the term *pennati* is used absolutely in the sense of 'wise' or 'prudent,' evidently on the strength of this text, and presupposing familiarity with it. 'Quantum in noctis tenebris malesanae mentis pedes

oberrent *ante oculos pennatorum* . . . Vident namque vos *pennati* et immaculati in via.' (The last phrase is of course again scriptural; see Psalm cxviii. 1.)

(35)

Par. xxv. 73. 'Sperino in te' nella sua *teodia*
Dice 'color che sanno il nome tuo.'

The point to explain here is the curious word *teodia*, applied to the Psalms of David; for the passage quoted being undoubtedly 'Sperent in te qui noverunt nomen tuum' (Ps. ix. 11), it settles the question that this is the application of the word. The Commentators, not recognizing the quotation, or being puzzled by the singular word *teodia*, imagined it to refer either to the Epistle of St. James (to whom Dante is speaking), or to God (who is referred to in the word *te*). The words '*sua* teodia' have consequently been commonly altered to '*tua* teodia.' Hence follow some very curious vagaries of interpretation: e. g. 'nella tua Teodia, cioè, nella tua deità' (*Buti*); 'cioè Scrittura divina, che tu scrivesti, o santo Jacopo' (*Ott.*); 'Et tu, Jacobe, in tuis Epistolis et Theodia, ita dicta a *theos,* quod est *Deus*, et *dia* quod est *duo,* quasi verba formata a Deo et prolata ab homine'(!) (*Pietro di Dante*). *Benv.* and *Vell.* preserve the reading *sua*, and rightly explain *Teodia* as *Psalmodia.*[1]

(36)

Par xxv. 90-93. Dell' anime che Dio s' ha fatte amiche
Dice Isaia, che ciascuna vestita
Nella sua terra fia di doppia vesta,
E la sua terra è questa dolce vita.

There is an extraordinary amount of variation in the punctuation and interpretation of this context, including in that term the previous line, which is sometimes united with l. 90. We are not now concerned with this question, except so far as it is affected by the quotation from Isaiah. I have

[1] The reader will not fail to notice how almost invariably these ἅπαξ λεγόμενα and other strange forms of words occur in the rhyme, thus throwing considerable doubt on the well-known boast attributed to Dante by the author of the *Ottimo Comento,* that he was never induced for the sake of a rhyme to say anything that he would not otherwise have said.

cited the passage in the form which I believe to be the correct one, both on other grounds and also from a consideration of the quotation. This is itself curious in form, being in fact a sort of 'conflate' quotation of two verses[1] not connected in the original. They are as follows. In Isaiah lxi. 7 we read—'propter hoc in terra sua duplicia possidebunt, laetitia sempiterna erit eis'; and in verse 10 'induit me vestimentis salutis, et indumento justitiae circumdedit me.' Further, the application of this made by Dante is somewhat singular, since he interprets the words as amounting to a promise of happiness both of body and soul in heaven, a happiness which is at present limited to two only, Christ and the Blessed Virgin, whose ascension or 'assumption' has enabled them to dwell already (l. 127)

Con le *due stole* nel beato chiostro.

The quotation appears to me to bear on the punctuation and consequent interpretation of the passage in Dante (at least in one particular point) in this way. The promise in Isaiah is made to a specially favoured class, who might well be described as

Anime che Dio s' ha fatte amiche.

For in the preceding verses we read—'Strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen and your vine-dressers. But ye (*Vos autem*) shall be named the Priests of the Lord: men shall call you the Ministers of our God: ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles, and in their glory shall ye boast yourselves.' Then follows the promise cited by Dante, which is made to those who have been thus described. I should therefore regard the words 'Dell' anime che Dio s' ha fatte amiche' as introducing a similar limitation here in respect of the recipients of the promise, and should consequently put no stop after *amiche*. Several editors put a full stop at *amiche*, making *Dell' anime* the genitive after *segno*, and inserting *ed esso lo mi addita* in a parenthesis.

[1] We may compare two instances of 'conflate quotations' in the Epistle to the Romans, where the passages conflated are much further apart—Rom. ix. 33 (from Isa. xxviii. 16 and viii. 13, 14) and xi. 8. (from Isa. xxix. 10 and Deut. xxix. 4).

We will now set together a few instances in which Dante's peculiar interpretation or treatment of some passages of Scripture quoted calls for some special comment.

(37)

John i. 3, 4. See **De Mon. III. ii. l. 42.**

In this quotation of St. John i. 3, 4, it will be observed that Dante not only adopts the unusual, but at the same time well attested form, 'Quod factum est, in ipso vita erat,' but he bases a singular argument upon it. He argues thus: 'Quod jus quum sit bonum, per prius in mente Dei est: et quum omne quod in mente Dei est, sit Deus (juxta illud: 'Quod factum est, in ipso vita erat'); et Deus maxime seipsum velit, sequitur quod jus a Deo, prout in eo est, sit volitum. Et quum voluntas et volitum in Deo sit idem, sequitur ulterius quod *divina voluntas sit ipsum jus*.'

I do not know whence Dante is likely to have derived this form of the quotation, as it is not found either in the Vetus Itala or the Vulgate, though it is well attested both in MSS. and Patristic quotations. He would indeed have found the passage so quoted by St. Augustine both in his Commentary *h. l.*, and also in De Genesi ad Literam, lib. v. §§ 31–33.

(38)

Ps. iv. 8. A fructu (*var. lect.* A tempore) frumenti, vini et olei sui multiplicati sunt.

It will be observed that the Vulgate differs here from E. V., but the use which Dante makes of the quotation in De Mon. I. xv. l. 22 still remains difficult. He adduces the statement of the Pythagoreans that 'one' belongs to the Category of Good, and 'many' or 'multiplicity' to the Category of Evil, and then argues that Sin may be described as 'holding to' the latter and 'despising' the former. This (he adds) the Psalmist perceived when he used the words above quoted. As a friend has kindly pointed out to me, the key to this application seems to be found in St. Augustine's Commentary on the passage: 'Non enim multiplicatio semper ubertatem significat, et non plerumque exiguitatem: cum dedita tem-

poralibus voluptatibus anima semper exardescit cupiditate, nec satiari potest, et multiplici atque aerumnosa cogitatione distenta, *simplex bonum videre non sinitur*. . . . Talis anima temporalium bonorum decessione et successione, id est, a tempore frumenti, vini et olei sui, innumerabilibus completa phantasmatibus sic multiplicata est, ut non possit agere quod preceptum est: "Sentite de Domino in bonitate, et in simplicitate cordis quaerite illum:" *ista enim multiplicitas illi simplicitati vehementer adversa est.*' (Enarr. in Psalmos *h. l.*) This interpretation seems to me clearly to give the key to Dante's application of the passage here. It is not necessary to suppose that he derived it directly from St. Augustine, as it may have been repeated in later commentaries, or may have been thus employed 'homiletically' in Dante's hearing. A similar suggestion has been made in reference to Dante's treatment of one or two other passages of Scripture.

(39)

Ps. viii. 2 (Vulg.) Elevata est magnificentia tua super coelos.

The use which Dante makes of this passage in Conv. II. iv. ll. 40 *seqq.* is peculiar, though quite in accordance with the logical and critical principles of interpretation then in vogue. It appears that the old astronomers held that there were only eight heavens or spheres circling round the immoveable earth in the centre of the universe, an 'erroneous opinion' shared even by Aristotle[1] (Conv. II. iii. ll. 20 *seqq.*). Next Ptolemy pointed out that there must be a ninth sphere, the 'Primum Mobile,' to account for the *diurnal* motion common to all the other eight spheres. But further, beyond all these nine spheres (see c. iv. l. 13) the Catholic religion obliges us to believe in a tenth, the Empyrean, the abode of God Himself, which is absolutely at rest, because it, and every part of it, fully possesses its natural perfection. The existence of this heaven, which neither the senses nor reason reveal to us, is implied in the language of the Psalmist, 'Elevata est magnificentia tua *super coelos*.'

[1] See further under Aristotle, No. 34.

(40)

Inf. xix. 106–111. Di voi pastor s' accorse il Vangelista,
Quando colei, che siede sopra l' acque,
Puttaneggiar co' regi a lui fu vista:
Quella che con le sette teste nacque,
E dalle dieci corna ebbe argomento,
Fin che virtute al suo marito piacque.

It is to be noted that Dante, evidently referring here to Rev. xvii. 1–3, either has a confused recollection of the original, or intentionally varies the allegory. The former seems more probable, as he is making a direct appeal to Scripture, and the force of his denunciation depends upon the scriptural authority cited. He would scarcely therefore be likely, as has been sometimes supposed, to take a liberty with the original. The variation is that (1) he attributes the seven heads and ten horns to the woman, whereas in Rev. xvii. 3 they belong to the 'beast[1]'; and (2) he evidently regards these as marks of privilege or distinction (l. 111), whereas the interpretation given a little later in the chapter of Revelation (vv. 9, 12) is a very different one: 'The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth . . . . and the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings.' It does not of course follow that these in themselves are necessarily a reproach or a monstrosity, but they certainly are so in the original, since neither the woman nor the beast at any stage are otherwise than evil monsters.

In reference to the differences between Dante and the original passage, whether intentional or accidental, it may be observed: (1) that in the Apocalyptic passage the woman and not the beast is the prominent figure; (2) that the symbolism of the woman and the beast is not very different, typifying as they seem to do the 'world-city' and the 'world-power' respectively[2], so that the transference of these details from one to the other does not distort or invert the general significance; (3) the ten horns, representing ten kings or kingdoms, though under the circumstances described by the Apostle, as well as

[1] This is clear from the context (see vv. 9, 12, 16) even if not from v. 3 itself, though this might possibly be held to be ambiguous in the Vulgate, as in E. V. There is no doubt in the Greek. Comp. also c. xiii. 1.

[2] See Speaker's Commentary, *h. l.*

those imagined by Dante, forming a monstrous and unholy growth, might well under happier circumstances be emblems of distinction to the Church (as some commentators interpret *argomento* here). They would indeed be so as long as her husband (i. e. the Pope) was 'found in the way of righteousness,'

Fin che virtute al suo marito piacque :

or, in other words, as long as his dominion over the ten (or any other number of) kingdoms was understood to be a spiritual dominion, according to the ideal traced by Dante in the De Monarchia. Finally, it may be noted that 'horns' as an *argomento* (in this sense) are attributed to the 'Lamb as it had been slain' in Rev. v. 6, 'which had seven horns and seven eyes.'

Again, in the mystical vision of Purg. xxxii. 142 *seqq.* the distorted car with its seven heads and ten horns is borrowed with very free alterations from Rev. xiii. 1. So that Dante could quite truly say, 'Simile mostro visto ancor non fue' (l. 147). A similar remark applies to Dante's modification in the same canto (ll. 148 *seqq.*) of the vision of the great harlot from Rev. xvii.

(41)

Inf. ii. 28–30. Andovvi poi lo Vas d' elezione,
Per recarne conforto a quella fede
Ch' è principio alla via di salvazione.

It is commonly said that Dante wrongly infers that the *Inferno* was visited by St. Paul from the description of his vision of the third heaven in 2 Cor. xii. 2. This is not necessarily so, though Dante may very likely have accepted the common mediaeval legend to that effect. He says 'Andov*vi*,' and if we look to the antecedent of this '*vi*' we find that it refers to the 'immortale secolo,' or 'the eternal world' generally. Moreover Aeneas (see l. 13) visited the Elysian fields as well as the place of torment; and further the promise of Virgil to Dante in Canto i had extended to Purgatory and Paradise, though the latter, was not to be under his own guidance. (See i. 114–126).

(42)

Par. xxiv. 125–126. Sì che tu [Pietro] vincesti
Ver lo sepolcro i più giovani piedi.

There is some interest attaching to this reference to St. John xx. 3–6, since in fact 'the other disciple (with 'più giovani piedi') did *outrun* Peter,' and Dante has again in this case been charged by some commentators with having forgotten the original, and in fact contradicted it. But it all depends on the meaning contained in *vincesti*. Dante evidently, I think, does not refer to the 'outrunning,' but to the fact that in spite of the advantage thus gained by St. John, St. Peter's strong faith ('che vedi ciò che *credesti* sì') caused him to anticipate St. John in entering the sepulchre, and so being the first to assure himself of the great truth. *Vincesti* thus acquires a more appropriate, instead of a merely superficial (even if not false) meaning. This is illustrated by another reference to the same incident in De Mon. III. ix. l. 111, 'Dicit etiam Johannes, ipsum [Petrum] introivisse subito, quum venit in monumentum, videns alium discipulum *cunctantem ad ostium*.' This shows what Dante regarded as the central feature of the incident.

(43)

Par. xx. 51. Morte indugiò per vera penitenza.

This reference to Hezekiah is interesting, because, as Scart. points out, it looks as if Dante had mixed up two different incidents in the career of Hezekiah. When he was 'sick unto death' we read that Hezekiah 'wept sore,' but this was in connexion not with penitence for past sins, but with a profession of his constant devotion to the service of God. 'I beseech thee, O Lord, remember now how I have walked before Thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in Thy sight.' See 2 Kings xx. 3. Upon this his life was prolonged. Afterwards he fell into the sin of pride and boastfulness, and his penitence for this is recorded in 2 Chron. xxxii. 26, and the consequence of that penitence was not that the life of Hezekiah was prolonged, but that the wrath of God was not executed in his days.

(44)

Par. xxiv. 38, 39. Intorno della fede,
Per la qual tu su per lo mare andavi.

It has sometimes been objected (as e.g. by Scart.) that Dante refers here to St. Peter's walking upon the sea as a proof of his faith, whereas on this occasion 'he began to sink,' and is therefore reproached by our Lord 'for his little faith.' See Matt. xiv. 28–31. But it may be replied that Dante is thinking chiefly of the initial act of faith which prompted the venture, in which at any rate Peter went beyond the other disciples.

(45)

Nimrod in Dante as compared with Scripture.

Dante goes beyond the account of Nimrod in Scripture by making him (1) a giant, (2) the deviser of the tower of Babel. In Inf. xxxi. he appears among the giants, and he is identified as the one

per lo cui mal coto
Pure un linguaggio nel mondo non s' usa. (ll. 77, 78.)

The same idea is found in Purg. xii. 34 and Par. xxvi. 126. Also in De Vulg. Eloq. I. vii. l. 26, the tower of Babel is described as erected 'sub persuasione gigantis.'

But the above points are quite commonly found both in patristic and mediaeval authorities, from several of which they may have found their way to Dante. St. Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xvi. 3, quotes Gen. x. 8, 9 in this form—'Hic coepit esse gigas super terram[1] (*Vulg.* 'potens in terra'). Hic erat *gigas* venator *contra* Dominum Deum' (*Vulg.* 'robustus venator *coram* Domino'). In ch. iv. St. Augustine insists on the reading *contra,* and declares that the rendering 'ante Dominum' arises from the ambiguity of the Greek word ἐναντίον. He proceeds: 'Erigebat ergo cum suis populis turrem contra Dominum, qua est impia significata superbia.' A little earlier in the chapter he states this to be a legitimate inference from the words of Scripture: 'Unde colligitur, gigantem illum Nebroth fuisse illius conditorem . . . . quamvis

[1] This is the reading of the *Vetus Itala.* See Sabatier *h. l.*

perfecta non fuerit usque in tantum modum quantum superba cogitabat impietas.' Perhaps we might illustrate the word *coto* in Inf. xxxi. 77. (i. e. as commonly explained *cogitatum*) by the passage just quoted. In any case, note how both St. Augustine and Dante (see Purg. xii. 34) lay stress upon the 'superbia' of Nimrod. It may be interesting to observe that Dante shows his familiarity with the opening chapters of De Civ. Dei also by the remarkable quotation in De Mon. III. iv. ll. 52 *seqq.* Among other authors likely to have been familiar to Dante, Isidore, Orosius, Hugh of St. Victor and Brunetto Latini recognize the same tradition as to Nimrod. The last named, in Tesoro, i. 23, speaks of 'Nembrot lo gigante, che fu il primo re di Babilonia,' and in chap. xxiv. he states 'quel Nembrot edificò la torre di Babel in Babilonia. . . . . E Nembrot medesimo mutò la sua lingua di ebreo in caldeo.' With this last singular statement we may compare Par. xxvi. 124–126, though Dante declares that the original Hebrew idiom spoken by Adam was extinct long before the building of Babel[1].

(46)

Luke x. 41, 42. See **Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 94** *seqq.*

Dante here makes a very surprising use of this passage, both in the application to which he puts it as a whole, and also in the strange perversion or misunderstanding of one of its clauses which seems to be involved in that application. He is arguing the superiority of the Contemplative over the Active Life. After citing Aristotle, he adds: 'And Christ affirms it with His own mouth in the Gospel of St. Luke, saying to Martha ". . . sollecita se', e turbiti intorno a molte cose: certamente una cosa sola è necessaria, *cioè quello che fai*,"' &c. The original word for *certamente* is 'porro.' Dante seems to take it in the sense of 'certainly,' i. e. 'it must indeed be admitted,' and so the words would become a qualified commendation up to a certain point of what Martha was doing. Dante's inference is that 'our Lord in this wishes to

[1] In the collection of novels called *Il Pecorone* (*c.* 1378) the same account of Nimrod is found. See Giorn. xv. Nov. i.

show' (l. 107) that the Active Life (typified by Martha) is *buona*, but the Contemplative Life (typified by Mary) is *ottima*; for 'Maria ottima parte ha eletta' (l. 100). Thus the strange interpretation put upon the words addressed to Martha is of the essence of the application which is made of them.

It occurred to me that as occasionally elsewhere Dante seems to have been indebted to St. Augustine for the interpretation of Scripture, perhaps he might have derived this from him. This passage is several times referred to by St. Augustine. As to the chief points in Dante's treatment of it, we find (1) the application of the incident to the contrast between the Active and Contemplative Life is, as we should expect, given by St. Augustine, e.g. Serm. civ. § 4; cclv. § 6; Quaestt. Evang. lib. ii. § 20, &c.: (2) the contrast between the two 'parts' as 'buona' and 'ottima' occurs two or three times; e.g. 'Tu bonam, sed ista meliorem' (Serm. clxix § 17); 'Non tu malam, sed illa meliorem' (Serm. civ. § 3; comp. ciii. § 3 and clxxix. § 3) &c.: (3) 'unum est necessarium' is more than once rightly explained by St. Augustine to refer to the choice of Mary; e.g. Serm. ciii. § 3 *fin.* &c.

But there are two or three passages which may have been floating in Dante's mind, in which St. Augustine speaks of the works of the Active Life as being *necessaria* (rather in the sense of the Greek *ἀναγκαῖα*), though the time will come when they will be so no more, whereas the Contemplative Life will endure for ever ('non auferetur'); and in these passages 'necessarium' is applied (as in Dante) to the action not of Mary but of Martha—e.g. 'Quod tu elegisti, transit. Ministras esurientibus; ministras sitientibus. . . . . Erit tempus ubi nemo esuriat, nemo sitiat. . . . Ergo cura tua auferetur a te.' (Serm. clxix. § 17.) Again, 'Plane auferetur ab omni homine qui ministrat sanctis ea quae sunt corpori necessaria, auferetur ab eo quod facit. Non enim semper ministraturus est sanctis. Cui enim ministrat nisi infirmitati?' &c. (Serm. clxxix. § 4.) Again, 'Duae sunt vitae: una pertinens ad *delectationem*, altera pertinens ad *necessitatem*. Quae ad *necessitatem*, laboriosa est: quae ad delectationem, voluptuosa est.' And a few lines later St. Augustine comments on the words 'porro unum est

necessarium,' thus: 'Unum verum, multa non erunt necessaria.' (Serm. cclv. § 6.) This last passage is very like that in Dante. Dante does not fall (nor was it likely) into the deplorable bathos of several commentators referred to in *Poli Synopsis h. l.*—'unum ferculum est necessarium et nobis sufficiens'! It will be noted, however, that this interpretation at least agrees with that of Dante in referring the 'unum necessarium' to the action of Martha; and it is also to be observed that a *var. lect.* respectably supported from the point of view of manuscript evidence—*ὀλίγων δὲ χρεία ἐστὶν ἢ ἑνός*—points in that direction.

Next come several passages which are rather reminiscences of Scripture than actual quotations from it. These may in most cases be dealt with very briefly.

(47)

Inf. xxxiv. 121. Da questa parte cadde giù dal cielo.

It is evident that Dante has in his mind Rev. xii. 8, 9, '. . . neque locus inventus est eorum amplius in coelo. Et projectus est draco ille magnus . . . et projectus est in terram. (Comp. v. 13.)

(48)

Purg. xii. 26, 27. giù dal cielo
Folgoreggiando scender da un lato.

The word *folgoreggiando* is, I believe, a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, but it is evidently formed to express the idea of St. Luke x. 18, 'Videbam Satanam *sicut fulgur* de coelo cadentem.'

(49)

Purg. xvii. 25, 26. Poi piovve dentro all' alta fantasia
Un crocifisso (*sc.* Haman).

This description of the punishment of Haman is explained by the Vulgate of Esther v. 14, 'Et jussit excelsam parari *crucem*.' In the later references to this, the word is 'lignum' or 'patibulum' (vii. 9, 10.)

(50)

Inf. x. 25. La tua loquela ti fa manifesto.

This, though it is not a quotation, nor are the words used

in the sense of the original, is almost a *verbatim* reproduction of Matt. xxvi. 73, 'Loquela tua manifestum te facit.'

(51)

Inf. xiii. 58–60. Io son colui che tenni ambo le chiavi
Del cor di Federico, e che le volsi
Serrando e disserrando sì soavi, &c.

Here again there is no actual quotation, but the metaphor of Pier delle Vigne, the grand chamberlain of Frederic, turning the keys of his heart, opening and shutting at his will, is no doubt suggested by Isa. xxii. 22, where similar language is used of Eliakim, who held a like office of authority and trust.

(52)

Inf. xvii. 74, 75. Qui distorse la bocca, e di fuor trasse
La lingua.

Again a reminiscence only, rather than a quotation of Isa. lvii. 4, 'Super quem dilatastis os, et ejecistis linguam.' Scart. suggests the probable imitation of this passage in support of 'bocca' as against the *var. lect.* 'faccia'.

(53)

Inf. xxxi. 61, 62. Sì che la ripa, ch' era perizoma
Dal mezzo in giù, &c.

This use of the curious word *perizoma*,='an apron,' must certainly have been suggested by this passage in Gen. iii. 7, 'Consuerunt folia ficus, et fecerunt sibi perizomata.' Dante certainly did not know enough Greek to have invented this word for himself by transliteration, and he probably had no notion why it should bear this meaning.

(54)

Purg. xxii. 128, 129. ed ascoltava i lor sermoni
Ch' a poetar mi davano intelletto.

Here again we have an interesting reminiscence of the Vulgate, as pointed out by Scartazzini, which is lost in the E. V. See Ps. cxviii. 130, 'Declaratio *sermonum* tuorum illuminat, et *intellectum* dat parvulis.'

(55)

Purg. xxix. 113, 114.

Le membra d' oro avea, quanto era uccello,
E bianche l' altre di vermiglio miste.

This description of the mystical gryphon is evidently borrowed from the book of Canticles. The gryphon, in its double nature, is a symbol or type of Christ. Its human portion is described in the words: 'E *bianche* l' altre (*sc.* membra) di *vermiglio* miste.' This, as Scart. points out, is suggested by Cant. v. 10, 'Dilectus meus *candidus* et *rubicundus*.' So too in the previous line the portion which was bird (i.e. the head) was of gold. This again is from the next verse in Canticles, 'Caput ejus aurum optimum.'

(56)

Purg. xxv. 49, 50. E giunto lui comincia ad operare,
Coagulando prima.

Throughout the whole of this passage Aristotle is closely followed, and not only the theories enunciated but many of the expressions in detail are directly borrowed from him, as will be more fully explained under Aristotle. In particular the frequent use of *συνιστάναι* in Aristotle, to which *coagulare* corresponds, is to be noticed. But this is not inconsistent with the supposition that Wisdom vii. 2 may also have been in Dante's mind, since the book generally and this chapter in particular are often quoted by him. The words are 'Coagulatus sum in sanguine ex semine hominis.' It is to be noted that the antecedent to *lui* is in fact *sangue*, though it is four lines back; and hence probably arose a *facilior lectio* 'lì.'

(57)

Purg. x. 58, 59. Dinanzi parea gente; e tutta e quanta
Partita in sette cori.

This description of David's triumphant recovery of the Ark, as given in 2 Sam. vi. 12 *seqq.*[1], illustrates what I have before said as to the necessity for consulting the Vulgate

[1] I have followed the Vulgate numbering of the Psalms, but I have adopted the more familiar nomenclature of the Books of Samuel and Kings.

rather than the E. V. for the source of Dante's quotations and references. The origin of the above is found in a clause that is omitted altogether in the latter, viz. 'Et erant cum David septem chori.' The same remark applies to

(58)

Purg. xi. 116, 117. quei (*i. e.* the Sun) la discolora,
Per cui ell' esce della terra acerba.

These words bear no resemblance to our version of Cant. i. 6, 'Look not upon me, because I am black, because the sun hath looked upon me'; but when we read in the Vulgate, 'quod fusca sim, quia *discoloravit me sol*,' we cannot but think that this passage, from a book with which we know Dante to have been familiar, was present to his mind, when he wrote these words.

(59)

Par. xxix. 28–30. Così il triforme effetto del suo Sire
Nell' esser suo raggiò insieme tutto,
Senza distinzion nell' esordire.

Here Dante has almost certainly in mind Ecclus. xviii. 1, 'Qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia *simul*,' which was a *locus classicus* for those who held this view of creation (e. g. Hugo of St. Victor, Peter Lombard, &c.). The force of this is lost in the E. V., which has, 'created all things *in general*.' In ll. 40, 41 Dante claims that this doctrine is taught 'in molti lati' of Scripture. He is no doubt referring there to the passage above quoted (which is employed in this sense by Peter Lombard), and also perhaps, as Scart. suggests, to Gen. i. 1, from which Aquinas drew a similar inference. Dante also proceeds to enforce his conclusion by the *a priori* argument (ll. 43–45) that a delay in the creation of the Angels would have delayed the perfection of the movers of the celestial spheres. With this comp. Conv. II. v, and also the similar argument of Plato in *Timaeus* 41 B (a context with which we know Dante to have been acquainted), *θνητὰ ἔτι γένη λοιπὰ τρί' ἀγέννητα· τούτων δὲ μὴ γενομένων, οὐρανὸς ἀτελὴς ἔσται· τὰ γὰρ ἅπαντ' ἐν αὐτῷ γένη ζώων οὐχ ἕξει, δεῖ δέ, εἰ μέλλει τέλεος ἱκανῶς εἶναι.*

(60)

Inf. iii. 34–51.

The peculiar detestation here expressed by Dante for the 'Vigliacchi (as Scartazzini calls them) or neutral sinners,

Che visser senza infamia e senza lodo,

was probably suggested by the language of Scripture respecting the lukewarm Laodiceans[1] in Rev. iii. 15, 16, such a denunciation falling in no doubt with his own feelings and sentiments, and encouraging this vigorous expression of them. '*Utinam* frigidus esses vel calidus' would seem to justify these sinners being more contemptuously treated, though not of course in fact more severely punished, than bolder offenders. Further, the peculiar expression 'incipiam te evomere ex ore meo,' 'I will spue thee out of my mouth,' is reflected in the refusal of either heaven or hell to find a place for them; they are scouted and repudiated by both—

Cacciarli i Ciel per non esser men belli:
Nè lo profondo inferno gli riceve,
Chè alcuna gloria i rei avrebber d' elli.

They were, in the language of Scott (*Rob Roy*), 'ower bad for blessing, and ower gude for banning.' The form of their punishment (as usually in Dante) is specially suited to their offence, viz. to be contemptuously ignored, to be treated as unworthy of any notice whatever, either good or bad; and subjectively at least (as Dante remarks), this sort of conscious annihilation is more galling than even severer punishment. Their feeling is '*ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον*'—

Invidiosi son d' ogni altra sorte.

The limits of our present subject forbid us to enter on the interesting psychological or moral questions that might be raised in respect to Dante's treatment of these sinners, and also of the neutral angels. But I may overpass these limits for a moment to refer to the interesting parallel (for which I am indebted to my friend Dean Paget) between this and Robert Browning's poem *The Statue and the Bust*, in which he deals with the perverted inference that might be drawn

[1] It is worth noticing perhaps also what a prominent position in the list of condemned sinners in Rev. xxi. 8 is assigned to 'Timidis et incredulis.'

from such language, that it would be better '*peccare fortiter*.' It is true that it might be *less contemptible* to do so, but not therefore in every sense *better*.

Note especially the following remarkable lines:—

> Let a man contend to the uttermost
> For his life's set prize, be it what it will!
> The counters our lovers staked were lost
> As surely as if it were lawful coin:
> And the sin I impute to each frustrate ghost
> Is the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin,
> Though the end in sight was a vice, I say.

I may also add one more consideration. The false inference with which we are dealing seems to involve the palpable fallacy of supposing that we have to do with a simple comparison between sin on the one hand, and abstention from sin on the other. But if the cause of that abstention be mere mean-spiritedness (*μικροψυχία, pusillanimità*), pure selfish indolence and dislike for exertion, it only amounts to substituting one sin for another, and that the one we happen to prefer. But we cannot compare two sins thus off-hand, since their relative guilt depends on infinite considerations of precedent and surrounding circumstances. Crimes may perhaps sometimes be thus roughly classed, but not sins.

In the next six passages the references commonly given to certain places in Scripture are open to some doubt.

(61)

Inf. xxxiii. 121 seqq. (The incident of Branca d' Oria.)

Compare Ps. liv. 16, 'Veniat mors super illos, et *descendant in infernum viventes*.'

Pietro di Dante suggests this source for the strange and horrible punishment devised by Dante for Treachery towards friends in Tolomea, viz. that the soul of the traitor is plunged into Hell while his body still lives and moves upon the earth (Inf. xxxiii. 122, *seqq.*). This suggestion seems to carry conviction with it when we regard the context in which the words

occur. It is precisely against this form of treachery that the Psalmist utters this imprecation: 'Quoniam si inimicus meus maledixisset mihi sustinuissem utique. . . . Tu vero homo unanimis, dux meus, et notus meus; Qui simul mecum dulces capiebas cibos, in domo Dei ambulavimus cum consensu. Veniat mors super illos, et descendant in infernum viventes.' Note also the idea conveyed in the two last verses of the Psalm: 'Tu vero Deus deduces eos in puteum interitus.' Compare 'Ella ruina in sì fatta cisterna,' l. 133. And again, 'Viri sanguinum et dolosi non dimidiabunt dies suos.' Compare

Il corpo suo l' è tolto
Da un demonio, ch' poscia il governa
Mentre che il tempo suo tutto sia volto (ll. 130–132);

and

Son più anni
Poscia passati ch' ei fu sì racchiuso (ll. 137, 138).

(62)

Inf. xxvi. 21–24. E più lo ingegno affreno ch' io non soglio,
Perchè non corra che virtù nol guidi;
Sì che se stella buona, o miglior cosa
M' ha dato il ben, ch' io stesso nol m' invidi.

Compare Ecclus. xiv. 6, 'Qui sibi invidet nihil est eo nequius.' It has been usual, and it is at first sight tempting, to quote this passage of Ecclesiasticus in illustration of the expression here used by Dante. But on looking closely to the context of the two passages it may be doubted whether the resemblance is more than superficial. The former writer seems to be denouncing a man who is too niggardly to allow himself to enjoy the good things which fortune has given him. He *grudges* himself such enjoyment as he might reasonably have, and thus *deprives* himself of it. The whole context seems to imply this (see especially vv. 3, 5, 10, 11, 14), and it is treated as a legitimate punishment for his misuse of wealth both in respect of getting and spending [1] (v. 6 *fin.*). The

[1] The idea is exactly that of Inf. xi. 45, 'Piange là dove esser dee giocondo.' Also compare the sentiment of Martial's Epigram (VIII. xix), 'Pauper videri Cinna vult, et est pauper.'

passage in Dante is generally understood to mean that Dante, being conscious of more than average intellectual gifts, grieves to think of the punishment which he saw in this Bolgia of the misuse of such gifts by the Evil Counsellors. For to the possession of them they owed the position and influence which alone made their sin possible. The recollection of their punishment causes him to be specially on his guard as to the use of such 'talents' in his own case, whenever and as often as the recollection of this scene in the Inferno oppresses his mind[1] (ll. 19, 20). And he is so (and then occurs the chief difficulty of the passage) lest this privilege should be forfeited through misuse or, as he expresses it (translated literally), lest he should himself grudge himself this gift, i. e. deprive himself of it. The notion of grudging or envying, and that of depriving, come very near together, as indeed the passage from the Apocrypha would show, and I am inclined to think that the latter meaning chiefly attaches to *invidi* as used here. In short, the secondary meaning is so prominent that the primary sense attaching to the word, if not entirely absent, is almost evanescent. The following passages would show an occasionally similar use in Classical Latin, where the notion of envying, if not wholly absent, is almost swallowed up in that of depriving:

> Sed mihi tarda gelu saeclisque effeta senectus
> Invidet imperium. Virg. *Aen.* viii. 508, 509.

> Ad talos stola demissa et circumdata palla,
> Plurima quae invideant pure apparere tibi rem.
> Hor. *Sat.* I. ii. 99, 100

See also Hor. *Od.* IV. ii. 22–24,

> Vires animumque moresque
> Aureos educit in astra, nigroque
> Invidet Orco.

[1] If this view is correct, this passage would not so much resemble those where Dante feels under restraint on account of the incredibility or strangeness of the matter to be related (e. g. xiii. 20; xvi. 124; xxviii. 113–114) as those in which he speaks of the abiding horror produced by every recollection of the scenes described (as in iii. 131, 132; xiv. 78; xvi. 12; xxii. 31; xxiv. 84; xxxii. 71, 72, &c.).

It may be added that the old Commentators seem to be unanimous (with slightly varying explanations) in explaining *invidi* by *privare* or *togliere*.

(63)

Purg. xv. 106, 107. Poi vidi genti accese in foco d' ira,
Con pietre un *giovinetto* ancider.

It has been ingeniously suggested by Scartazzini that Dante is led to represent Stephen as *giovinetto* from a slightly confused reminiscence of Acts vii. 57, where Saul is described as 'a young man' assisting at the stoning of Stephen. It is however I think more probable that Dante is merely influenced by the traditional representation of St. Stephen as a young man in Sacred Art, this being itself perhaps due to the comparison of his face to that of an angel in Acts vi. 15, angels being always represented as in the bloom of youth. We might illustrate the idea conveyed to Dante's mind in *giovinetto* by his use of it Purg. vii. 116 of Alfonso III, *aet.* about 25; and again in Par. xi. 58 of St. Francis, then *aet.* 24. Beccaria, *Alcuni Luoghi*, &c. (p. 140) observes that *adolescentulus* is used by Cicero of himself when aged 27, and of Caesar when he was aged *c.* 33. It seems therefore hardly necessary to suppose that Dante has here fallen into any such confusion as is suggested by Scartazzini.

(64)

Inf. xxxi. 10. Quivi era men che notte e men che giorno.

This has been compared—again it must be admitted conjecturally—with Zech. xiv. 6, 7, '. . . non erit lux, sed frigus et gelu. Et erit dies una quae nota est Domino, non dies neque nox.' The reference is very doubtful, but the connexion with 'frigus et gelu[1]' is noticeable, this being the peculiar feature of this Circle of the Inferno. The chief interest in the possible reference to Zechariah lies in its bearing on the interpretation of the passage, as it would justify the contention (which does not however depend upon this) that no 'time reference' is indicated here, such as evening twilight,

[1] These words, it will be observed, do not occur in the E.V.

but that a general condition of this portion of the Inferno is thus described. This seems to be implied by l. 37, 'forando l' aura grossa e scura.' There was a permanent gloom like the 'aria senza tempo tinto' of Inf. iii. 29. See further my *Time References in the D. C.*, pp. 52, 53; but as this question is not bound up with the establishment of the reference suggested, we need not discuss it further here.

There is a very similar passage in Ovid, *Metam.* iv. 399–401, and one specially apposite, supposing the passage in Dante should refer to the hour of twilight:

> Jamque dies exactus erat, tempusque subibat
> Quod tu nec tenebras, nec possis dicere lucem,
> Sed cum luce tamen dubiae confinia noctis.

(65)

Par. xi. 95, 96. La cui mirabil vita
Meglio in gloria del ciel si canterebbe.

This is a case in which a probable reminiscence, if not a direct quotation, of a scriptural passage has been thought to throw light on a much-disputed interpretation. St. Thomas, in the full flow of his generous praises of the rival 'patriarch' St. Francis, checks himself with the reflection above quoted. The Commentators (as Scart. points out) have almost all gone strangely adrift over the interpretation of these words. His own explanation of them, which follows that of Benvenuto da Imola, is in effect as follows. St. Thomas has said so much of the marvellous life and work of St. Francis that he feels it is time to recognize that it was the grace of God that made him what he was, and to glorify God for so great a gift to His suffering Church rather than extol any further the work of St. Francis himself. 'It were better to sing of his marvellous life to the glory of heaven.' Though he does not quote the actual words, there seems to be present to his mind the language of the Psalmist, "Non nobis, Domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam' (Ps. cxiii. 1). In other words, the Italian 'in gloria' would correspond with the Latin 'in gloriam,' and not (as generally taken) 'in gloria.'

It is obvious to note that they were already 'in gloria coeli,' so that, if the words be taken in this sense it might seem that there is no contrast to justify *meglio*.

I was rather disposed to accept this interpretation, though much hesitating about '*in gloria del ciel*' being equivalent to '*in gloriam coeli*' or *Dei*, but since writing the above I have met with a curious passage quoted in the *Studi Danteschi* of Michele da Carbonara from an old life of St. Francis (*auct.* Prudenzano), the resemblance of which to this passage is so striking as to make it very probable that it was in Dante's mind, especially when it is observed that da Carbonara shows a considerable number of very curious resemblances throughout this Canto with the early contemporary literature about St. Francis, such as the *Fioretti di san Francesco*, the *Regola di San Francesco* (by himself), the *Vita di San Francesco* by Tommaso da Celano, and other similar works. In the *Vita* by Prudenzano it is stated that at first the Frati used to sing in Church (*in coro*) the life and virtues of St. Francis. But by the time of Dante they had degenerated [as we see in fact from Par. xii. 115, *seqq.*] and ceased to venerate him. On which Prudenzano observes, 'Dai Serafini (tanta era stata la virtù del Santo) le Salmodie in onore di lui *meglio e più degnamente sarebbesi cantate nella gloria del cielo*, anziche da' suoi frati degeneri in coro.' The resemblance to this passage in the Paradiso is so striking that it can scarcely be accidental. This would tend to throw further doubt upon the interpretation given above, on the strength of the supposed reference to the Psalms *l. c.*

(66)

Par. xxvi. 43–45. Sternilmi tu ancora, cominciando
L' alto preconio, che grida l' arcano
Di qui laggiù sopra ogni altro bando.

There is an interesting question as to the identification of the scriptural reference intended here. The context must be carefully considered. Dante declares to St. John (ll. 16–18) that God is the final object of his love, the beginning and end of every lesson that Scripture (reading *Scrittura*) teaches him on the subject of Love; or 'of every precept (*scrittura*) that

teaches him love,' or 'of every precept that love teaches him': for though the general purport of the passage is clear, the actual translation of the words is much disputed. St. John demands (ll. 22–24) more definite information as to the means by which he was guided to this truth. Dante replies (ll. 25–27) that both Reason and Revelation, both Philosophy and Scripture, have impressed it on him. Analysing this still more in detail, he mentions his obligation under the former head to Aristotle (there can scarcely be a doubt that he is intended[1]) in ll. 37–40, and under the latter to Moses, in ll. 40–42, and to St. John himself, in ll. 43–45. So the order of proofs (in ll. 25, 26), viz. (1) Philosophy, (2) Revelation, is preserved. And the Old and New Testaments combine to teach the same lesson, just as Dante declared to be the case in regard to *Faith* in xxiv. 91–99, in his confession to St. Peter; and also in regard to *Hope* in his confession to St. James, by quoting the Psalms and Epistle of St. James as his guiding lights (see xxv. 70–78[2]); the point being further emphasized in ll. 88, *seqq.*, and supported by another pair of quotations from Isaiah and St. John. In the case of Faith and Hope, however, there naturally is not, as in the case of Love, any reference to 'filosofici argomenti.' But the question before us is to determine the particular passage in St. John to which Dante's language refers in the lines quoted above.

It would seem then to be (1) near the beginning of the work referred to, and (2) in that work of St. John which the language of the last two lines aptly describes. Both these considerations at once (as I think) exclude the reference rather confidently determined on by Mr. Butler, viz. 'God is love' in 1 Ep. iv. 8 and 16. The description in ll. 44, 45 surely does not suit the Epistles of St. John, and the particular quotation (though otherwise suitable) is near the *end* of the Epistle. The words '*l' alto preconio*,' &c., are in different senses applicable

[1] Not only should we doubt any other authority than Aristotle being referred to in such general language by Dante, but also there are definite passages in Aristotle fully justifying such a particular reference as this; e. g. especially *Metaphys.* Λ, c. 7 and 8; (1072 a. 26 and b. 3). Also compare Par. xxiv. 130–132.

[2] It is interesting to observe these frequent evidences of a symmetry of plan between the different parts of both the Purg. and Par.

either to the Gospel or the Apocalypse ; to the former as being the fullest revelation (as compared with the other Gospels) of the secret purpose of Heaven (' l' arcano di qui ') in the work of Redemption, the latter as being the fullest revelation (as compared with other books of Scripture) of the secrets and mysteries of the unseen world. Neither work can be said to be excluded by this description, though I cannot but think that *preconio* much more naturally applies to the Gospel. Compare *praeco* as a preacher in 2 Pet. ii. 5 ; so that *preconio* would correspond with εὐαγγέλιον, and the same may be said perhaps even more confidently of the word *bando* or proclamation. And further, the teaching of Love is a much more prominent feature of the Gospel than of the Apocalypse. In fact one can scarcely imagine any one appealing to the latter at all for such teaching : it is rather a ' vision of judgment.' Commentators have been generally divided between the Prologue to the Gospel and the declaration in Rev. i. 8, ' I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord.' (See also vv. 11 and 17, though in the case of v. 11 the words are probably an interpolation, and they are not found in the Vulgate.) In favour of the reference being to the Apocalypse it is argued that the passage has already been, if not quoted, at least distinctly referred to by Dante in l. 17. But it is surely a strong objection to supposing either the Apocalypse, or the Prologue to the Gospel to be here referred to, that there is nothing in either specially relating to the subject of Love.

I am inclined therefore on the whole, in preference to any of the explanations above given, to suggest that the reference is chiefly to John iii. 16, ' God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son,' &c. The context in which this occurs —the conversation with Nicodemus—though not actually in the first few verses of the Gospel, can certainly in another sense be considered as ' the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ '—' cominciamento dell' alto preconio.' It is a striking and novel announcement ; it is our Lord's first declaration of the central truth of the Gospel ; it is the embodiment of ' the heavenly things ' (' l' arcano di qui,' l. 44) for which our Lord

has solemnly prepared Nicodemus in v. 12, by describing the coming declaration as consisting of ἐπουράνια—'coelestia.' This appears to me in fact to fulfil all the various conditions which the language of Dante in the three lines under consideration lead us to look for, or at any rate to do so far more satisfactorily than any of the other references that have been suggested

---

A few passages follow from the Convito, in most of which, it will be seen, some question arises as to the form or accuracy of the quotation. Of course this is more likely to be the case in a prose work, where quotations are made formally, and more accuracy is to be expected. Doubtless, as is constantly the case with New Testament quotations from the Old Testament, and patristic quotations from both (and for the same reason), Dante trusted generally to his memory, and did not undertake the labour, disproportionate to the purpose in hand, which would be involved in securing verbal accuracy by verification.

(67)

Conv. IV. xxi. l. 58. Come sono . . . investigabili le tue vie !

Dante here quotes Rom. xi. 33 ; the concluding words, 'et investigabiles viae ejus,' appearing as 'e investigabili le tue vie.' The form of the Latin word seems to explain the curious use of *investigabili*, as a sort of transliteration, in Italian ; since, strictly speaking, '*in*investigabili' would be required to give the meaning intended.

(68)

Conv. IV. xxiii. l. 105. Onde dice Luca, che era quasi ora sesta quando morìo, che è a dire lo colmo del dì.

This is a very singular misquotation of St. Luke xxiii. 44, which may however very well have been a slip of memory. In the passage of the Convito Dante is defending the thesis that everything in our Lord's life was so ordered, that the Divinity should in no case appear 'in discrescere,' (*al.* 'in discenscione'). Consequently He died (1) in his thirty-fourth

year[1], just before reaching the top of the arch of human life, which after thirty-five 'sta in discrescere'; and (2) He died just before the day began to decline, i.e. about the perfect hour of noon: and in support of this he quotes St. Luke for the statement that it was about the sixth hour when He died, 'che è a dire lo colmo del dì.' Now St Luke makes this statement not of the hour of the death of Christ, but of His words to the penitent thief, and he then goes on to say that darkness overspread the earth 'until the ninth hour, and the sun was darkened, and the veil of the temple was rent in the midst.' He then adds, 'And Jesus cried with a loud voice . . . and gave up the ghost.' Thus the natural inference would be, though it is not expressly stated, that St. Luke supposed our Lord to have died about the ninth hour, i.e. about 3 p.m. And this we find appears quite distinctly from St. Matthew (xxvii. 46) and St. Mark (xv. 34). It is singular that Dante should not only have quoted St. Luke thus inaccurately, but should also have forgotten the explicit statements of SS. Matthew and Mark which were fatal to his somewhat fanciful theory.

(69)

Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 139. Però dice Salomone, . . . 'Odi, figlio mio, l' ammaestramento del tuo padre.'

This is quoted from Prov. i. 8, 'Audi, fili mi, disciplinam patris tui, [et ne dimittas legem matris tuae].'

Again, *ib.* l. 171,

Onde dice l' Apostolo alli Colossensi: 'Figliuoli, ubbidite alli vostri *padri* per tutte cose.'

The passage quoted is Col. iii. 20, 'Filii, obedite *parentibus* per omnia.'

[1] Note the singular speculation in c. xxiv, ll. 64 *seqq.*, that if our Lord had died a natural death, He would have lived to 81 (9×9), as was the case with Plato, who was 'ottimamente naturato' (l. 58). It is also a curious illustration of the different conclusions at which persons led by *a priori* considerations may arrive, that Irenaeus strenuously supports a tradition that Christ was about fifty years old at His death (a tradition itself probably evolved out of St. John viii. 57, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old,' &c.), because he says that Christ came to sanctify and set an example to all the stages of human life, not infancy and youth only, but mature life also. (See Iren. *adv. Haer.* II. c. xxxix. §§ 2–4). The idea that fifty represented maturity is probably based on such passages as Num. iv. 3, 35, 39; viii. 25, &c.

As a comment on the omissions or alterations occurring in these quotations, I will transcribe a note from p. 143 of my little work on *Dante and his Early Biographers* :—

It has sometimes been observed that Dante never regards the mother in any other light than that of a nurse (and very beautiful indeed are some of the passages in which he does so), never as though having any share in parental authority. It is remarkable that in Conv. IV. xxiv, quoting Col. iii. 20, he substitutes *padri* for *parentes* : 'Figliuoli, ubbidite alli vostri *padri* per tutte cose' ; and he proceeds to consider the modifications in this command required if the father be dead, or if he had died without appointing a guardian to his children ; but among several possible substitutes for parental authority he never mentions the mother. Shortly before, in the same chapter, when quoting Prov. i. 8, to prove that obedience is the special virtue of youth, he gives only the first clause, 'My son, hear the instruction of thy father,' omitting 'and forsake not the law of thy mother.'

(70)

Conv. IV. xxiv. ll. 162 seqq. E però scrive Salomone nelli *Proverbii*, 'che quegli che umilmente e ubbidientamente sostiene dal correttore le sue corrette riprensioni, sarà glorioso.'

There seems to be no passage in the Proverbs corresponding very closely with the citation in Dante, which has all the appearance of being intended to be a direct and *verbatim* quotation. He was probably thinking of Prov. xv. 31, 'Auris quae audit increpationes vitae in medio sapientium commorabitur.' He seems to be quoting from memory, and to have fairly well recollected the general sense though not the actual words, especially as regards the vague 'sarà glorioso' representing 'in medio sapientium commorabitur.'

(72)

Conv. IV. xxv. l. 19. [Dice Salomone], 'Rimovi da te la mala bocca, e gli atti villani sieno lungi da te.'

This quotation again is not quite exact, the latter part standing thus in the Vulgate at Prov. iv. 24 : 'detrahentia labia sint procul a te.' The *Vers. Antiqua* (*auct.* Sabatier) has 'injusta labia' But I cannot find any version or quotation of the passage with anything like *atti villani*, so that Dante was probably quoting from memory.

ARISTOTLE.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century the star of Aristotle was very much in the ascendant, and especially with the Dominicans. It is remarkable however that even within the limits of that century Aristotle had been condemned, and the study of his writings forbidden, by the Doctors of the University of Paris, and by the authority of Pope Gregory IX. But no writer then, or at any other time, has surpassed Dante in the admiration and reverence expressed for Aristotle. For Dante he is *par excellence* 'il Maestro,' 'il Filosofo'; and among other titles of respect under which his opinions are introduced are the following:— 'Il Maestro dell' umana Ragione'; 'il Maestro della nostra Vita'; 'il Maestro e Duca dell' umana gente al segno di felicità'; 'Magister sapientium' (V. E. ii. 10): to which we may add his well-known title in Inf. iv. 131, 'Il Maestro di color che sanno,' or, as it appears in plain prose, 'il Maestro dei Filosofi' (Conv. IV. viii. l. 141). He is 'degnissimo di fede e d' obbedienza' (Conv. IV. vi. l. 50); 'dove aperse la bocca la divina sentenza d' Aristotile, da lasciare mi pare ogni altrui sentenza' (Conv. IV. xvii. l. 23). He is 'quello glorioso Filosofo, al quale la Natura più aperse li suoi segreti' (Conv. III. v. l. 55); and Dante proceeds in the same passage (in which the Immobility of the Earth is asserted on Aristotle's authority) to add, that he need not repeat Aristotle's arguments, since to those for whom he writes it is enough to know the fact 'per la sua grande autorità' (*ib.* l. 62). In this manner he is quoted over and over again as an authority from whose *dicta* there can be no appeal. On two occasions indeed Dante ventures to criticize him, but with evident hesitation and deference. In Conv. II. iii. l. 20 he demurs to his opinion that there were only eight heavens, but Dante adds that Aristotle was only following 'l' antica grossezza degli astrologi'; and further (l. 32) that Aristotle has expressly guarded himself with this apology in *Metaph.* xii (for which see Index), and that in this 'sentenza

così erronea,' he is only following those who have a right to speak on their own subject. He seems however in the next chapter to have some compunction, for after explaining how Catholics are bound to believe in a tenth heaven beyond even the nine which Ptolemy, advancing upon Aristotle, taught, he adds somewhat vaguely: and even Aristotle appears to think this, to one who rightly understands him, in the first book of the *De Coelo et Mundo*. The other passage referred to above occurs in Conv. II. v. ll. 11 *seqq.*, where Aristotle's opinion as to the limited number of the 'primi movitori' is somewhat timidly censured. 'Furono certi filosofi, de' quali *pare* essere Aristotile nella sua "Metafisica" (avvegnachè nel primo "di Cielo e Mondo" *incidentemente paia* sentire altrimenti), che credettero,' &c.

Another point to notice is the very general and thorough character of Dante's knowledge of Aristotle's writings. A glance at the citations which I have collected in the Index will show that Dante was acquainted, and in many cases intimately acquainted, with most of Aristotle's various works. The only important exception to this which occurs to me is the *Poetics*, of which Dante appears to have known nothing. And it is a case where quotations must certainly have occurred if the work had been known, since in the second book of De Vulgari Eloquio the resemblance of the subject-matter must have suggested many such references. In regard to the Logical works of Aristotle, they are sometimes definitely cited, and on many other occasions we have a more or less close reproduction of *dicta* found in them, but many of these had doubtless become commonplaces in mediaeval and scholastic treatises on Logic, so that direct acquaintance with Aristotle is not necessarily implied by their citation.

It will of course be understood that Dante had access to Aristotle only through Latin translations. The passage in Conv. II. xv. ll. 60 *seqq.* is well known, in which Dante naïvely declares his inability to ascertain the precise opinion of Aristotle about the Milky Way, on account of the inconsistent versions of it given by the 'Old' and 'New' translations. This passage will be found discussed in the Essay on

the Translations of Aristotle used by Dante, and these two translations, as I believe, are there identified. But it does not by any means follow that Dante's references to Aristotle are in all cases derived directly or at first hand even from the translation which for him must be regarded as 'the original.' I have pointed out elsewhere that in many cases doubtless the *compendia* or versions of Albertus Magnus were quoted as Aristotle, and then they simply took the place of the more direct translation. But when all possible allowance has been made for second-hand references and derivative information, the amount and variety of Dante's knowledge of the contents of the various works of Aristotle is nothing less than astonishing. It becomes more so when we recollect that it was combined with a very remarkable knowledge of the works of so many other authors besides.

From these two considerations—I mean Dante's reverence for the authority of Aristotle, and his copious knowledge of his works—it follows, as we should expect, that in every department of Dante's almost encyclopaedic knowledge not only are the foundations laid upon Aristotle, but many of the details are borrowed directly from him, and asserted upon his authority as final and sufficient. This is so very largely in Ethics, almost exclusively in Physiology and Physics (including in the latter term both Cosmical and Meteorological Physics), and to a very considerable extent in Politics, Psychology, and Metaphysics, making allowance for the new colouring imparted to these subjects by Theology and Revelation, especially as these are interpreted by the authority of the Catholic Church. A few brief and general illustrations may be given before we proceed to the discussion of passages in detail. One of the cardinal features of Dante's ethical system is the distinction between sins of *Incontinenza* and *Malizia*, and the less heinous character attaching to the former. This is of course Aristotle's familiar distinction between ἀκρασία and κακία, and it is definitely justified by Dante as such in Inf. xi. 79–84[1].

[1] This subject, as well as that of the further distinction of sins of violence and fraud, and the purpose of Dante's allusion to θηριότης, will be found more fully discussed in the Essay on Dante's Classification of Sins.

Another fundamental point in Ethics which Dante borrows from Aristotle is the doctrine of the Mean in Virtue, and he also adopts in detail Aristotle's classification of Virtues and their related Vices as given in *Ethics* II. vii. This will be found in Conv. IV. xvii.

But besides this there can be little doubt that there are minor points in Dante's classification of sins, and especially some arrangements which seem to us surprising or anomalous, which are to be accounted for by the influence of Aristotle. Thus the strange combination in their punishment of Suicides and Spendthrifts (Inf. xi. 43, 44 and xiii.) is surely suggested by a recollection of *Nic. Eth.* IV. i. 5, *δοκεῖ δὲ ἀπώλειά τις αὐτοῦ εἶναι καὶ ἡ τῆς οὐσίας φθορά, ὡς τοῦ ζῆν διὰ τούτων ὄντος.* Similarly, the still more strange collocation of Sodomites and Usurers, Inf. xi. 49–51, 94–111; xvii. 43 *seqq.*, is explicitly based upon a *dictum* of Aristotle in the *Physics*[1] (see Inf. xi. 101) that Art follows Nature, and so the inference is that those who offend against the principles of one offend against those of the other, and thus those who sin against God, or Nature (the child of God), or Art (the child of Nature), are associated in their punishment. The prosyllogism which is wanted to bring Usury under this category would also be supplied by Aristotle, *Pol.* I. x. *fin.* (1258 b. 7), *ὁ δὲ τόκος γίνεται νόμισμα νομίσματος· ὥστε καὶ μάλιστα παρὰ φύσιν οὗτος τῶν χρηματισμῶν ἐστίν.* It may be added that a passage in *Ethics* IV. v. 8–10 (1126 a. 13 *seqq.*), where Aristotle distinguishes among the different types of anger, the violent, the quickly-irritable, and the sulky, though not directly quoted by Dante, affords not improbably the clue to the distinction in Inf. vii. between the violent anger punished on the surface of the Stygian pool (ll. 112–117), and the sullen or sulky anger punished by immersion in the mud at the bottom of it (ll. 118–126). This corresponds at any rate to two, and those the most markedly contrasted of Aristotle's four types or subdivisions of Anger.

[1] Probably *Phys.* II. ii (194 a. 21), *εἰ δὲ ἡ τέχνη μιμεῖται τὴν φύσιν, κ.τ.λ.*, or perhaps II. vii. (199 a. 15), *ὅλως δὲ ἡ τέχνη τὰ μὲν ἐπιτελεῖ ἃ ἡ φύσις ἀδυνατεῖ ἀπεργάσασθαι, τὰ δὲ μιμεῖται.*

It should be also noticed that there are of course many passages in which Aristotelian ideas and phrases are interwoven into the texture of Dante's language both in prose and verse, even when he is not explicitly quoting him; as for instance when, in Conv. III. xv. l. 81, he says that in a certain supposition, 'Natura l' avrebbe fatto indarno'; or when he cites Parmenides, Melissus, and Bryson as examples of misguided and erring reasoners in Par. xiii. 125 (comp. De Mon. III. iv. l. 30). Or again, when in Par. xvii. 24 he describes himself as

Ben tetragono ai colpi della ventura,

we cannot mistake the tacit reference to *Nic. Eth.* I. x. 11 (1100 b. 21), especially when we remember that the words there occur in reference to a man's power of resisting 'the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune.' So again he sometimes uses expressions which (as I have noted in the introductory part of this Essay) imply for their intelligibility, or at least for their full comprehension, a familiarity on the part of his readers with some theory or statement of Aristotle[1].

It has been a matter of extreme difficulty to know how to arrange the large number of passages here discussed. To follow the order either of Dante's works, or of those of Aristotle, would lead to an inconvenient dislocation of subjects naturally connected. On the other hand, to attempt a classification according to subjects would prove a task almost as difficult as that of the subject-catalogue of a library, the lines of demarcation being impossible to maintain. On the whole, I have thought it better to group passages more or less together where there was an obvious connexion of subject, leaving a large number without any attempt at arrangement, since they can be readily found by the help of the index.

I have already mentioned that in quoting authors like Aristotle, Virgil, Ovid, Cicero, and others, Dante almost always refers to the title of the work quoted, and generally to the number of the Book if the work be so divided. Unfortunately,

[1] See *sup.* p. 18.

in the case of Aristotle, the further division into chapters had apparently not yet been made. Hence even when Dante gives the number of the Book, the identification of some of his quotations has been a matter of great labour and difficulty, nor is the conclusion arrived at always free from doubt. The passages quoted are frequently by no means prominent or striking in themselves; they are given (as in the Convito) in Italian, and clothed in this form often from the recollection of a Latin translation not always very faithful to the original, and itself possibly sometimes two removes from that original, since many of the Latin translations (though not that which I suppose to have been generally used by Dante) were made not from the Greek, but from Arabic versions of it. Sometimes, doubtless, they were taken from paraphrases of Aristotle, such as those of Albertus Magnus or Averroes. It is easy to see how an ordinary passage, undergoing all or some of these processes, may have become so disguised as to be very difficult indeed to identify, when we have no clue beyond that of the number of a long book in which it is supposed to occur. It is also to be observed that either from a slip of memory on the part of Dante himself, or by a copyist's error in the MSS., the number of the Book is not always correctly given. Considering, however, the enormous labour involved in verifying references when MSS. were not generally at hand, and when, if consulted, they were not provided with indexes, chapter-divisions, or numbered lines, and often ran on for many pages, perhaps a whole Book, without a break, one can only feel surprised at the rarity of any such false references in Dante.

A word of explanation must be added in reference to the pseudo-Aristotelian work De Causis[1]. I have entered the references made to it by Dante under Aristotle, because though he never mentions Aristotle's name in connexion with it in his quotations, he probably held it to be a work of his, in accordance with the common belief of his times. It was

[1] For a further account of this work and the various titles under which it was known, see Jourdain, *Traductions d'Aristote*, p. 183. See also Perez, *La Beatrice Svelata*, p. 162.

commentated on as a work of Aristotle by Albertus Magnus and by St. Thomas Aquinas, and Dante no doubt was acquainted with it through the 'Antiqua Translatio' used by St. Thomas. I had some doubt at one time as to the identity of the 'De Causis' and the 'Delle Cagioni,' but having identified all but one of Dante's quotations with passages in the Antiqua Translatio of the De Causis in the works of Aquinas, I have no doubt this was the work in all cases referred to by Dante. I mention this because it has been sometimes supposed that it was the De Causis of Albertus from which Dante is quoting. For instance, at Conv. IV. xxi. l. 90 Giuliani, assuming Albertus to be quoted, accuses Dante of distorting his language. But it will be found that the passage cited in the Index *h. l.* from the so-called Aristotelian De Causis is quoted quite exactly. My references are given to the Lectiones of St. Thomas, and to the pages of the folio Paris Ed. of 1647.

We proceed now to the discussion and explanation of selected passages, taking first those derived from the Ethics. It may perhaps be convenient if I append a rough outline of the method of grouping which I have adopted for the Aristotelian quotations, though I do not attach much importance to it (as I have said before), and the principles of division also sometimes cross one another.

1. Ethics and Politics.
2. Mental Science, including Psychology, Metaphysics, and Logic.
3. Physics.
4. Meteorology.
5. Physiology.
6. Passages bearing on Textual Criticism.

(1)

The Aristotelian Definitions of Virtues in Conv. IV. xvii.

It is obvious that all Dante's definitions of Moral Virtues in this passage of the Convito, the list of which is taken from Nic. Eth. II. vii., are reproductions, more or less exact, of the definitions as given by Aristotle, either there, or in Books III

and IV, though they do not profess to be direct quotations. The influence of Aristotle is specially remarkable in Dante's definitions of Temperance (moderating excessive abstinence, as well as the other extreme, which Aristotle contends is true in theory, though the former is not found in experience); of Meekness (moderating not only anger, but also too great patience with external ills); and also in that of Prudence, how it holds a sort of ambiguous position between Moral and Intellectual Virtues, and how, though strictly the latter, it cannot be dissociated from the former; for this see especially Eth. Bk. I. xiii. 20 (1103 a. 6) and VI. xiii. 6 (1144 b. 30). It is to be noted that in the case of the three Social Virtues, Dante follows the order adopted by Aristotle in Bk. IV. ch. vi–ix., instead of the more logical order in Bk. II. ch. vii. Also that he translates *φιλία* by *Affabilità*, and that the definition, that it makes us 'ben *convivere* cogli altri' comes rather from IV. vi. 1 (1126 b. 11), '*Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὁμιλίαις καὶ τῷ συζῆν*,' κ.τ.λ. than from Bk. II., where its central feature is *τὸ ἡδὺ ἐν τῷ βίῳ*. This remark is also true of the other two Social Virtues, especially in the case of *Verità* (*ἀλήθεια*).

(2)

Par. viii. 113–120.

The passage is interesting as containing a series of familiar Aristotelian quotations from the Ethics and Politics, which are appealed to as indisputable—

'Se il maestro vostro ben vi scrive.'

These are—(1) the well-known *dictum* often quoted or referred to by Dante, '*οὐδὲν μάτην ἡ φύσις ποιεῖ*,' which also occurs frequently in Aristotle; (2) '*φύσει πολιτικὸς ἄνθρωπος*;' and (3) '*οὐ γίγνεται πόλις ἐξ ὁμοίων*,' Pol. I. ii. (1261 a. 24). Dante quotes the first passage with the limitation 'in essentials' both here—'in quel ch' è uopo' (l. 114)—and again in De Mon. I. x. l. 3, 'in necessariis.' It is probable therefore that he had specially on his mind De An. III. ix. (432 b. 21), '*εἰ ἡ φύσις μήτε ποιεῖ μάτην μηθέν, μήτε ἀπολείπει τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων*.'

(3)

Conv. IV. xvii. l. 73. Queste (i.e. Virtù Morali) sono quelle che fanno l' uomo beato, ovvero felice, nella loro operazione.

The distinction between 'beato' and 'felice' in this passage seems to be a reminiscence of the distinction drawn between μακάριος and εὐδαίμων in Nic. Eth. I. x. 13, 14 (1100 b. 33 *seqq.*). This is confirmed by the reference immediately following to the definition of Happiness, 'nel primo dell' Etica.' It will be noted that the sentiment is precisely that of Aristotle *l. c.*, where he says that a virtuous man can never become ἄθλιος, and though he may cease to be μακάριος, he will still remain εὐδαίμων. In other words, as Dante says, the practice of Virtue (ἐνέργειαι κατ' ἀρετήν) will secure that a man shall remain at any rate *felice*, even if not *beato*. The more exalted sense attaching to *beato* accords with Dante's use of the words *beato* and *beatitudine* elsewhere in Paradiso, Convito, and Vita Nuova. Also the contrast occurs again a little below, ll. 91–3, where Dante says that by the Active Life we arrive at *buona Felicità*, but by the Contemplative at *ottima Felicità e Beatitudine*.

(4)

Conv. IV. xix. ll. 84, 85. Vergogna non è laudabile, nè sta bene ne' vecchi nè negli uomini studiosi.

This is Dante's version of the well-known passage in Nic. Eth. IV. ix. § 3, 4, πρεσβύτερον δ' οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐπαινέσειεν ὅτι αἰσχυντηλός. . . . οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπιεικοῦς ἐστὶν ἡ αἰσχύνη. It is to be noticed that the Translatio Antiqua has 'neque enim *studiosi* est verecundia.' This is an unusual word for ἐπιεικής, and later translations have *probus* (see further the essay on the Translation of Aristotle used by Dante).

(5)

Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 46 seqq. Siccome dice il Filosofo nel sesto dell' *Etica*, 'impossibile è essere savio chi non è buono'; e però non è da dire savio uomo chi con sottratti e con inganni procede, ma è da chiamare *astuto*.

The statement that it is impossible to be *savio* or *prudent* (see l. 42) without goodness comes directly from Nic. Eth.

VI. xiii. 6 (1144 b. 30–32), as stated by Dante. The further distinction between *savio* and *astuto* is evidently derived from the previous chapter (1144, a. 23–29), and corresponds with the distinction drawn by Aristotle between φρονιμός and πανοῦργος. This becomes even more evident when we find the Antiqua Translatio rendering these two words by *prudens* and *astutus* respectively. (The word δεῖνος seems to have puzzled the translator, as he transliterates it by *dinoticus*, but this does not affect the words Dante is dealing with.)

(6)

Inf. xxxi. 55–57. Chè dove l' argomento della mente
S' aggiunge al mal volere ed alla possa,
Nessun riparo vi può far la gente.

There can be little doubt that Dante had here in his mind either one or both of the following passages of Aristotle—Pol. I. ii. 15, 16 (1253 a. 31–35), ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ τελεωθὲν βέλτιστον τῶν ζῴων ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ χωρισθὲν νόμου καὶ δίκης χείριστον πάντων· χαλεπωτάτη γὰρ ἀδικία ἔχουσα ὅπλα· ὁ δ' ἄνθρωπος ὅπλα ἔχων φύεται φρονήσει καὶ ἀρετῇ, οἷς ἐπὶ τἀναντία ἔστι χρῆσθαι μάλιστα.

Also Nic. Eth. VII. vi. 7 (1150 a. 4, 5), ἀσινεστέρα γὰρ ἡ φαυλότης ἀεὶ ἡ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος ἀρχήν, ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἀρχή. (This is to show that θηριότης is ἔλαττον κακίας, φοβερώτερον δέ.)

The comparison of these passages is interesting as it may bear on the interpretation of the difficult word *argomento*. It is sometimes explained as if = 'reason,' but other commentators take it as = 'instrument' or ὅπλον, and among these Benvenuto, who translates and comments — 'instrumentum rationis in homine, qui est armatus ratione.' He then proceeds to quote the above passage from the Politics (as does also Pietro). The language of Aristotle, which I think was clearly in Dante's mind, seems to me very strongly to support this interpretation. It may also be defended by Dante's own use of *argomento* elsewhere, e. g. Purg. xxx. 136, 'Tutti *argomenti* . . . Alla salute sua eran già corti, Fuor che mostrargli le perdute genti;' Purg. ii. 31, 'Vedi che

sdegna gli *argomenti* umani,' where the context shows it to be = instruments, or ὅπλα, such as oars or sails. It is probable that it means 'equipment' also in Inf. xix. 110, 'dalle dieci corna ebbe *argomento*.' Further, numerous passages are quoted in the *Vocab. Tram.* s. v. from prose writers, especially Boccaccio and M. Villani, where *argomento* is simply = instrumentum, such as engines of war, crowbars, agricultural implements, &c.

(7)

Purg. ii. 115 seqq.; iv. 1–12. Conv. II. xiv. ll. 187 seqq.

These are three passages in which Dante refers to the absorption of the whole Soul or Mind through the intense preoccupation of some one of its faculties, and in particular this is applied to the sense of hearing when absorbed by Music or by some interesting discourse. This effect of Music is twice referred to, once in Purg. ii. ll. 115 *seqq.*, where the spirits are entirely possessed with the charm of Casella's song to the exclusion of all other thoughts; and again in a more general way in the following passage of the Convito: 'Ancora la Musica trae a sè gli spiriti umani, che sono quasi principalmente vapori del cuore, sicchè quasi cessano da ogni operazione; sì è l'anima intera quando l'ode, e la virtù di tutti (*sc.* gli spiriti) quasi corre allo spirito sensibile che riceve il suono' (II. xiv. ll. 187 *seqq.*). With this should be compared the very difficult passage in Purg. iv. 1–12, where a similar effect is attributed to the intense interest excited in Dante by his interview with King Manfred. We may note especially the expression in l. 11, 'Ed altra quella che ha l'anima intera.' I cannot here enter on the detailed explanation of this difficult passage, but both in this and in the others above quoted, one can scarcely doubt a reminiscence of Ar. Nic. Eth. X. v. §§ 3, 4 (especially as Dante elsewhere makes a direct quotation from this same Chapter)—*οἱ γὰρ φίλαυλοι ἀδυνατοῦσι τοῖς λόγοις προσέχειν, ἐὰν κατακούσωσιν αὐλοῦντος, μᾶλλον χαίροντες αὐλητικῇ τῆς παρούσης ἐνεργείας· ἡ κατὰ τὴν αὐλητικὴν οὖν ἡδονὴ τὴν περὶ τὸν λόγον ἐνέργειαν φθείρει. ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων*

συμβαίνει ὅταν ἅμα περὶ δύο ἐνεργῇ· ἡ γὰρ ἡδίων τὴν ἑτέραν ἐκκρούει, κἂν πολὺ διαφέρῃ κατὰ τὴν ἡδονήν, μᾶλλον, ὥστε μηδ' ἐνεργεῖν κατὰ τὴν ἑτέραν.

I add now five passages in which some difficulty occurs in identifying Dante's quotations of the Ethics, or in which Aristotle seems to be quoted inaccurately.

(8)

Conv. I. xii. ll. 75 seqq.

This is a curious citation of a passage purporting to come from Aristotle, Ethics, Bk. V.:—'Justice is so lovable that, as the Philosopher says in the fifth Book of the Ethics, its enemies love it, such as thieves and robbers.' There does not appear to be any such passage in Aristotle, either in Ethics, Bk. V., or elsewhere. One is tempted to suppose that Dante, being familiar from some source or other with this version of the well-known sentiment that there must be 'honour among thieves,' hastily assumed that it came from Aristotle, and from that part of his works where it was most likely to be found, as suggested by the word 'giustizia,' without further 'verifying his references[1].' There is a passage in Plato, Rep. Bk. I, more nearly resembling this, but Dante does not appear to have been acquainted with this work. We might compare the vigorous version of the same sentiment by Sir Thomas Brown: 'The devils do not tell lies to one another, for truth is necessary to all societies, nor could the society of hell exist without it.'

It is singular that another reference to Ethics, Bk. V, in Conv. II. xv. l. 128, should suggest a similar suspicion, or at any rate that Dante's knowledge of Bk. V. was less accurate than usual. The passage runs thus:—'Chè, siccome dice il Filosofo nel quinto dell' *Etica*, la giustizia legale ordina le scienze, ad apprendere, e comanda, perchè non sieno abbandonate, quelle essere apprese e ammaestrate.' This seems to be a confusion between such a passage as Bk. V. ii. 10, 11 (1130 b. 22–26)—where the law is said to enjoin the

[1] See another such case suggested under No. 29, *ad fin.*

practice of all the Moral Virtues (cf. ch. i. 14) in the enactments whereby it regulates public education (*παιδείαν τὴν πρὸς τὸ κοινόν*)—and Bk. I. ii. 5 (1094 a. 28 *seqq.*), where *πολιτική*, which is not very different in sense perhaps from 'giustizia legale,' is said to prescribe what sciences shall be studied and to what extent by the citizens.

In these two last and similar cases it might perhaps be suspected that Dante may have mixed up some commentary or paraphrase with the text itself, as I have elsewhere suggested to have been the case with Virgil and the commentary of Servius (Virgil, No. 26). See another case under No. 11.

(9)

Conv. I. xi. ll. 46 seqq. L' abito di virtude, *sì morale come intellettuale*, subitamente avere non si può, ma conviene che per *usanza* s' acquisti.

Aristotle is evidently referred to in this assertion, though he is not mentioned by name. At first sight it looks as if *usanza* referred to *ἐθισμός*, and as though Dante had transferred to *ἀρετὴ διανοητική*—which '*τὸ πλεῖον ἐκ διδασκαλίας* (as contrasted with *ἐξ ἔθους*) *ἔχει τὴν γένεσιν*' (see Eth. II. i. 1; 1103 a. 15)—a statement only applicable to *ἠθικὴ ἀρετή*. But as Aristotle proceeds (*l. c.*) *διόπερ ἐμπειρίας δεῖται καὶ χρόνου*, and as Dante's point here is to insist that neither kind of excellence can be acquired suddenly (*subitamente avere*), the statement which he makes is not an inaccurate representation of this passage in the Ethics by which it was no doubt suggested.

(10)

Conv. I. xi. ll. 140 seqq. Al magnanimo le sue cose sempre paiono *migliori che non sono*, e l' altrui meno buone.

The same can perhaps scarcely be said of this obvious Aristotelian reference occurring towards the end of the same chapter. Aristotle certainly would not allow this of the *μεγαλόψυχος*, since his self-estimate, however exalted, is not exaggerated. See especially Eth. IV. iii. 3 and 13 (1123 b. 2 and 25).

(11)

Conv. IV. xiii. ll. 71 seqq. L' uomo si dee trarre alle divine cose quanto può.

We have here a quotation from Eth. X. vii. 8 (1177 b. 31), '*οὐ χρὴ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς παραινοῦντας ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα οὐδὲ θνητὰ τὸν θνητόν, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀθανατίζειν*,' and it is thus represented. The singular point is that Dante introduces the quotation as from Aristotle, 'nel decimo dell' *Etica, contra Simonide poeta parlando.*' There is no mention of the name of Simonides or that of any one else in the Ethics *l. c.* Aristotle merely says *οὐ χρὴ κατὰ τοὺς παραινοῦντας*, κ.τ.λ. Indeed some editions and manuscripts of the Convito (among the latter my own) read here, *contro a sermoni dei poeti.* This possibly originated from an ingenious conjecture of some copyist who remembered the passage in Aristotle, or perhaps was ignorant of Simonides. The former appears to be the true reading; the explanation being that in the commentary of Aquinas accompanying the Antiqua Translatio we find these words, 'et fuit hoc dictum Symonidis poetae.' Moreover (as Fraticelli notes) Aquinas makes a similar statement in his 'Summa contra Gentiles,' I. c. v.[1], and we note particularly that he quotes Aristotle in this form—'quod homo debet se ad immortalia et divina *trahere* quantum potest.' Here we seem to have the precise form of Dante's quotation, since there is nothing corresponding to *trahere* or *trarre* either in the original of Aristotle or in the Antiqua Translatio (which merely says, 'in quantum contingit immortalem facere'), or in the paraphrase of St. Thomas *h. l.*

St. Thomas justifies his statement that Simonides is here aimed at, by giving a reference to Metaph. A. ii. (982 b. 30), where a somewhat similar sentiment, that knowledge is the peculiar privilege of God and not man, is attributed to Simonides and disallowed by Aristotle.

Two other points are worth noticing. (1) This *same chapter*

[1] The exact passage is as follows:—Cum autem Simonides cuidam homini praetermittendam divinam cognitionem persuaderet . . . contra eum Philosophus dicit quod homo debet se ad immortalia et divina *trahere* quantum potest.

of the 'Summa contra Gentiles' is directly quoted by Dante a little later, viz. Conv. IV. xv. l. 125, and the work is referred to in a general manner in Conv. IV. xxx. l. 29, as though he were familiar with it. (2) It is an interesting coincidence that the same form of the quotation appears in the Quaestio de Aqua et Terra, § 22, l. 3, 'ut trahant se ad immortalia et divina pro posse.' This and many other similar coincidences in the quotations and expressions found in the Quaestio, impress me rather strongly in its favour, as they are not so obvious as to indicate the conscious imitations of a forger. They have much more the air of 'undesigned coincidences.'

(12)

De Mon. III. iii. l. 12. Aegyptius vero Scytharum civilitatem [*sc.* ignorat], non propter hoc de ipsorum civilitate contendit.

Dante here evidently has in his mind the passage in Nic. Eth. III. iii. § 6, where Aristotle says πῶς ἂν Σκύθαι ἄριστα πολιτεύοιντο οὐδεὶς Λακεδαιμονίων βουλεύεται. Dante seems to have substituted 'Egyptian' for 'Lacedaemonian' by a slip of memory.

(13)

Inf. ii. 88–90. Temer si dee di sole quelle cose
Ch' hanno potenza di fare altrui male:
Dell' altre no, che non son paurose.

This passage is discussed here because it appears to me that a possible recollection of Nic. Eth. III. vi. § 4 (quoted below) may offer an explanation of the acknowledged difficulty of giving any appropriate meaning to *altrui*. As far as I have been able to ascertain, no commentator and very few translators have noticed it. Mr. Butler maintains that *altrui* is simply equivalent to an indefinite pronoun such as 'aliquis,' 'one,' or 'man' (in German). This seems to me to be a very questionable use of the word in any case, and the passages quoted in illustration, both by Mr. Butler and Diez, Gram. Rom. Sprache, iii. 76 (p. 84, ed. 1877), scarcely appear to justify it. I doubt whether *altrui* is ever used

merely as an indefinite pronoun pure and simple. I suspect that the idea of 'others' always underlies it, with more or less distinctness, often, I doubt not, with less, as compared with a rendering of it by that actual term in English. But in the present place I would point out (1) that it would be eminently liable to be understood, and to be taken in its more usual sense, thus altering the whole character of the passage, and therefore it would be not likely to have been employed in this unusual and exceptional manner. (2) A much stronger objection is to be found in the painfully flat truism which would thus be credited to Dante, and that too in a passage where such a triviality would be singularly out of place. Can any one imagine Dante saying (to adopt the paraphrase given by Guido Pisano) that we need fear only those things, 'quae possunt inferre aliquod nocumentum. Illa vero quae nocere non possunt nullatenus timere debemus'? Verily *προφήτας οὐδένας μαστεύομεν*[1]—'we need no seer to tell us this!'

It has occurred to me that some light may be thrown on this sentiment, 'that we need fear those things alone by which another may be injured,' by a possible recollection of the passage above mentioned from the Ethics. In the Greek it stands thus:—*πενίαν δ' ἴσως οὐ δεῖ φοβεῖσθαι οὐδὲ νόσον, οὐδ' ὅλως ὅσα μὴ ἀπὸ κακίας μηδὲ δι' αὐτόν.* In the Antiqua Translatio printed in the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, which I have endeavoured to show in a later Essay was probably the translation of Aristotle used by Dante, the passage stands thus: 'Non oportet timere neque &c. . . . neque universaliter quaecunque non a malitia neque propter seipsum.' Now there is no ambiguity about the Greek, owing to the use of *μηδέ*, but the Latin is certainly ambiguous, and might equally represent an original *οὐδέ*. In fact, with a comma or pause after *malitia*, it would naturally convey this meaning, and I have found it printed so in one edition of this 'Translatio,' implying that one editor at least so understood it. If then Dante, with the Latin only before him, so misunderstood the words, he might suppose he was reproducing the sentiment of 'Il Filosofo' when declaring

[1] Aesch. Agam. l. 1099.

that we ought to fear not for ourselves (neque propter seipsum), but only for what may bring harm to others. At any rate, I throw this out as a possible explanation of a difficulty that I have not seen otherwise explained at all. Thus the following are some of the translations or comments—'di far *ci* male' (D. Rossetti), 'to do one harm' (W. Rossetti), 'have the power of hurting' (Carlyle), 'whence evil may proceed' (Cary), 'Schaden zuzufügen' (Philalethes). Longfellow (accurate as usual) has, 'the power of doing others harm,' but does not notice the 'hard saying.' So also Febrer in the Catalan translation, 'de fer mal ad altruy.' It is not noticed (among the earlier commentators) by della Lana, Ott., Land., Vell., or Daniello. The Anon. Fior. paraphrases correctly, but gives no explanation. Buti is content to observe sagely, 'Questa è notabile e verissima sentenzia.' Boccaccio, I find, refers to Ethics, Bk. III in a general way as the source of this passage—'Siccome Ar. nel terzo dell' Etica vuole'; but when he comes to paraphrase l. 89, he merely says 'che possono nuocere.' He has by the way a curious reading in l. 90 which I have not met with elsewhere, 'E l' altre no, che non son *poderose*,' adding the words '*a nuocere*' to complete the idea. In the recently published Essay on 'Dante and the New Reformation' by Mr. J. W. Cross, this passage, interpreted in the manner I have advocated, is quoted as exhibiting 'the fundamental idea' of the Divine Comedy. 'It is essentially a social basis. The application of the idea to life will enlarge with the developing conscience of mankind. . . . If we could conceive of a world where the doctrine was not only preached but practised, we could conceive of a world without sin.' (p. 86.) This perhaps seems rather to exaggerate the importance of the passage, as much as many of the other writers quoted let it fall into the background.

The next group of quotations may be brought together under the general head of Mental Philosophy, including therein Psychology, Metaphysics, and Logic. I do not feel at all able to deal adequately with this part of the subject, nor to distinguish Dante's debt to Aristotle in these subjects

from that which he owed to St. Thomas Aquinas and other scholastic writers. There are however, as it will be seen, many passages, the meaning and phraseology of which can only become intelligible by reference to Aristotle, and there are some of extreme obscurity *prima facie* which become entirely clear when interpreted by this aid.

As an illustration of the last remark I will take the following admittedly very difficult passage:

(14)

Par. xxix. 31–36. Concreato fu ordine e costrutto
Alle sustanzie, e quelle furon cima
Nel mondo, in che puro atto fu produtto.
Pura potenza tenne la parte ima;
Nel mezzo strinse potenza con atto
Tal vime, che giammai non si divima.

Now this is little more than an adaptation of a passage in the De An. II. ii. *ad fin.* (414 a. 14 *seqq.*): *τριχῶς γὰρ λεγομένης τῆς οὐσίας καθάπερ εἴπομεν, ὧν τὸ μὲν εἶδος, τὸ δὲ ὕλη, τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν· τούτων δὲ ἡ μὲν ὕλη δύναμις, τὸ δὲ εἶδος ἐντελέχεια· ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἔμψυχον, οὐ τὸ σῶμά ἐστιν ἐντελέχεια ψυχῆς, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ σώματός τινος* (414 a. 14–18). From this point of view the technicalities of Dante's language are easily cleared up. It will be observed that Aristotle recognizes three degrees or orders of existence:—

1	2	3
εἶδος (forma)	*ὕλη* (materia)	
or	*or*	both combined
ἐντελέχεια (actus)	*δύναμις* (potentia)	

These reappear in Dante as—

Puro atto	Pura potenza	Potenza con atto

and these correspond with

Angels	Matter	Created things

Dante maintains that all these three were created simultaneously, on the strengh no doubt of Ecclus. xviii. 1 ('Qui vivit in aeternum creavit omnia simul') and other similar

passages (see ll. 28–30 and 40, 41). In this he follows P. Lombard and Aquinas, and corrects St. Jerome, who taught otherwise (l. 37, *seqq.*). Further, Dante declares (though this of course has nothing to do with Aristotle) that after their creation Lucifer and his angels fell before you could count twenty (!). See l. 49. See also Conv. II. vi. (l. 96), 'si perderono alquanti *tosto che furono creati.*' A consideration of these passages together will perhaps serve to correct the charge of inconsistency made against Dante by Scart., for saying (1) that the *Inferno* was eternal in Inf. iii. 7, 8, Dinanzi a me non fur cose create Se non eterne; and (2) that it was formed in the centre of the earth (which therefore pre-existed), by the fall of Lucifer (Inf. xxxiv. 121–6).

(15)

Par. xiii. 61 seqq. Quindi discende all' ultime potenze
Giù d' atto in atto tanto divenendo,
Che più non fa che brevi contingenze.

The Divine Essence is here represented as entering into the several orders of Being in a constantly diminishing degree, as they are removed in a descending scale from the Divine source of all Being. This may be illustrated by the Gnostic doctrine of successive emanations from the Pleroma, which it closely resembles. But the idea is also an Aristotelian one. For Dante's language, if not derived from, bears an interesting resemblance to, Aristotle *De Mundo*, c. vi.[1] (397. b. 27 *seqq.*). Here, after describing God, in the language of poetry, as seated at the supreme point of the universe, he adds—*μάλιστα δέ πως αὐτοῦ τῆς δυνάμεως ἀπολαύει τὸ πλησίον αὐτοῦ σῶμα, καὶ ἔπειτα τὸ μετ' ἐκεῖνο, καὶ ἐφεξῆς οὕτως ἄχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τόπων. διὸ γῇ τε καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔοικεν ἐν ἀποστάσει πλείστῃ τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ ὄντα ὠφελείας ἀσθενῆ καὶ ἀκατάλληλα εἶναι καὶ πολλῆς μεστὰ ταραχῆς*, κ.τ.λ. Add to this 398 b. 20, *ἡ θεία φύσις ἀπό τινος ἁπλῆς κινήσεως τοῦ πρώτου τὴν δύναμιν εἰς τὰ συνεχῆ δίδωσι, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνων πάλιν εἰς τὰ πορρωτέρω, μέχρι ἂν*

[1] I am not aware, however, of any case in which Dante cites this work, or certainly shows acquaintance with it. See, however, Quaestio, xx. l. 52 (*inf.* p. 124).

διὰ τοῦ παντὸς διεξέλθῃ. And with this compare Par. ii. 121 *seqq.*

> Questi organi del mondo così vanno,
> Come tu vedi omai, di grado in grado,
> Che di su prendono, e di sotto fanno.

The same idea is again found in Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 44 *seqq.*, where the quality and capacity of the *Intelletto possibile* in each individual is said to vary with its degree of removal from the *Prima Intelligenza*, 'quanto più è dilungata dalla Prima Intelligenza.'

There is also a passage in Albertus Magnus, Phys. Lib. II. Tr. i. ch. 5 (*med.*), which so closely corresponds with the ideas and almost with the language of Dante in these and several other passages, that it is worth transcribing, especially as he was a writer with whom Dante shows himself often to have been familiar. Further this is the very chapter in which Albertus discusses the distinction between *Natura Universalis* and *Natura particularis*, which is repeated several times by Dante, and which he seems to have derived from this chapter. At any rate I have not been able to discover any other source for it (see *inf.* p. 155). Albertus quoting (and it is true in certain respects impugning) the doctrine of Hermes Trismegistus, says this:—'. . . quod natura egrediens est vis egrediens a prima causa per motum coeli, quae quia est processio quaedam facta a prima causa quae movet primum causatum, est virtus principians motum: et quia per motum coeli egreditur, est ipsa virtus incorporabilis particularibus, et *diversificatur in illis secundum diversitatem recipientium*, et efficitur nobilior et minus nobilis, et efficacior et minus efficax, *secundum quod est propinquior et remotior a prima causa, ex qua in inferiora procedit.* Finally we note the same idea in Dante in Convito III. ii. ll. 27 *seqq.*; III. vii. ll. 11 *seqq.* (in both these cases quoting the De Causis) and again in Epist. X. § 27, l. 511, quoting here the De Coelo I. ii. *fin.* (269 b. 16).

In the next two or three passages again Dante uses technical expressions, which are borrowed directly from Aristotle, though not explicitly quoted from him. The full and proper meaning

of such passages can therefore only be understood by a reference to Aristotle's original use of the language in question.

(16)

Such an expression is,

Purg. xxix. 47. L' obbietto comun, che il senso inganna,

or, as we have it in Convito, IV. viii. l. 49, *sensibili comuni, là dove il senso spesse volte è ingannato.* This comes directly from De Anima, II. vi. (418 a 7–19) where Aristotle contrasts the κοινὸν αἰσθητόν and the ἴδιον αἰσθητόν, the latter being that περὶ ὃ μὴ ἐνδέχεται ἀπατηθῆναι[1]. The former relates to qualities perceptible by more than one sense. It may be doubted whether Dante employs the term accurately in this passage of the Purgatorio (see Mr. Butler's note *h. l.*), but in that from the Convito he certainly appears to do so, and at any rate this is the case in Conv. III. ix. l. 62, where the expression is paraphrased 'cose che con più sensi comprendiamo.' Still there is no doubt as to the source from whence his phraseology is derived.

(17)

Par. xxix. 76 seqq.

Another case may be taken from the phenomena of memory as referred to by Dante in Par. xxix. 76–81. Dante says that the vision of the angels is never interrupted or broken off by new objects (God and God alone filling all their thoughts); they do not need to remember *per concetto diviso.* This seems to refer to Aristotle's theory of memory in the tract περὶ μνήμης καὶ ἀναμνήσεως, c. 1; see especially 450, a. 25–32, b. 10 and 14–29. He says in effect that memory (in which function there occurs the apparent anomaly of our being affected by an absent object) is possible owing to the continuance in the mind of a φάντασμα of the object, or a τύπος τοῦ αἰσθήματος, like the impression of a seal, and consequently when this impression does not persist (as from different causes occurs in the extremes of youth and of old age), then there is

[1] Compare also De Anima, III. 3 (428 b. 20–30), where Aristotle adds that the error to which αἰσθητὸν κοινόν is liable, happens especially ὅταν πόρρω τὸ αἰσθητὸν ᾖ. This illustrates Purg. xxix. 48, 'Non perdea *per distanza* alcun suo atto.' See also *ib.* 427 b. 12, ἡ αἴσθησις τῶν ἰδίων ἀεὶ ἀληθής, καὶ πᾶσιν ὑπάρχει τοῖς ζώοις.

no memory. This *φάντασμα* or *τύπος τοῦ αἰσθήματος* remaining after the object which excited it has disappeared, seems to be exactly what Dante means by *concetto diviso* in this passage.

(18)

Purg. xv. l. 15. Che del soperchio visibile lima.

The expression, '*soperchio visibile*' is probably suggested (as Mr. Butler points out) by the Aristotelian statement in De An. II. xii. (424 a. 29), *τῶν αἰσθητῶν αἱ ὑπερβολαὶ φθείρουσι τὰ αἰσθητήρια.* Comp. III. ii. (426 a. 30, &c.), where Aristotle shows how this holds good of all the several senses, as well as of sight, to which Dante here applies it. But an even closer parallel may be found in Probl. ΛΑ. 28 (960 a. 21 *seqq.*), where Aristotle makes the same observation in reference to the apparent anomaly of our seeing better by interposing the hand as a screen between our eyes and the sunlight, which is precisely the action described by Dante in the text. Two other passages in the Purgatorio are explained by the same references, viz. viii. 36 and xvii. 53.

(19)

Conv. II. ix. l. 63. E questo [i. e. that the soul is immortal] massimamente par volere Aristotile in quello *dell' Anima.*

When Dante here quotes Aristotle as teaching the Immortality of the Soul, the unusual vagueness of the terms of reference seems to betray some little uncertainty on the subject. The expression '*par volere*,' and the absence of the usual reference to the exact Book in the treatise quoted are noticeable. There are two passages which, though they scarcely prove Dante's point, may possibly have been in his mind, viz. either Bk. ii. 2 (413 b. 26), *ἔοικε ψυχῆς γένος ἕτερον εἶναι, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἐνδέχεται χωρίζεσθαι, καθάπερ τὸ ἀΐδιον τοῦ φθαρτοῦ*; or Bk. iii. 5 (430 a. 23), *χωρισθεὶς (ὁ νοῦς) δ' ἐστὶ μόνον τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἐστί, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀΐδιον.* The reference to the former passage at any rate is made probable by the fact that it is cited *verbatim* in De Mon. III. xvi. l. 28, which shows that Dante was familiar with it. And as to the second passage, though

prima facie and out of its context it looks favourable to Dante's view, it is really against it, since χωρισθεὶς refers to the 'Intellectus agens.'

(20)

Conv. II. x. ll. 66-68. L' atto dell' agente si prende nel disposto paziente, siccome dice il Filosofo nel secondo *dell' Anima.*

Another rather doubtful citation, which seems to refer to De An. II. v. *ad fin.* (414 a. 25), ἑκάστου γὰρ ἡ ἐντελέχεια ἐν τῷ δυνάμει ὑπάρχοντι καὶ τῇ οἰκείᾳ ὕλῃ πέφυκεν ἐγγίνεσθαι. The quotation by Dante is certainly not very precise, but it may have come closer to the Latin form in which the passage was presented to him. This was probably two removes from the original, being more likely than not translated into Latin from Arabic (see Jourdain, Traductions Latines d'Aristote, p. 170). Another passage, in the De An. Bk. ii., may be added in illustration; but the passage above cited seems to come nearest to the language of Dante. In c. 5 (417 a. 17), πάντα δὲ πάσχει καὶ κινεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητικοῦ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ ὄντος· διὸ ἔστι μὲν ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὁμοίου πάσχει, ἔστι δὲ ὡς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνομοίου . . . πάσχει μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἀνόμοιον, πεπονθὸς δ' ὅμοιόν ἐστιν. It may be noted that Dante displays some knowledge of ch. ii. of the second Book of the De Anima elsewhere (see Index).

(21)

Purg. xxv. 62-65.

Quest' è tal punto
Che più savio di te fe' già errante;
Sì che, per sua dottrina, fe' disgiunto
Dall' anima il possibile intelletto,
Perchè da lui non vide organo assunto.

It has been very much disputed whether Averroes or Aristotle himself is the 'savio' here referred to. On many grounds the former seems more probable, partly because he emphasized and pressed home, so to speak, the inference to be drawn from the language of Aristotle in De An. III. ch. iv. and v.; and partly because even if Dante were conscious that Aristotle himself fell into this error, he would be more

likely to keep this in the background, especially when he had a scapegoat ready to hand in the person of Averroes. In any case the language of Dante closely resembles that of Aristotle *l. c.*, and may well be illustrated by it. In ch. iv. (429 a. 22–27) we read that ὁ καλούμενος τῆς ψυχῆς νοῦς has no separate organ like the senses; and in ch. v. we find that this νοῦς is the νοῦς παθητικός (*possibile intelletto*), and further that ὁ παθητικὸς νοῦς φθαρτός (430 a. 24). In this and other similar passages Aristotle seems to pronounce against individual or personal immortality. This seems to be another reason for not supposing Aristotle to be here censured, since, as we have seen [*sup.* No. 19], Dante endeavours to enlist Aristotle as a supporter of the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and unless this can be understood of the individual soul or 'Intellectus possibilis,' it would have no practical value for us.

(22)

Par. xxvi. 38, 39. Colui che mi dimostra il primo amore
Di tutte le sustanzie sempiterne.

The reference here also cannot be considered certain, and besides Aristotle, Plato Pythagoras and Dionysius the Areopagite have been suggested by commentators as the author intended (see Scartazzini *h. l.*). The preponderance of opinion is in favour of Aristotle, and with this I am disposed to agree, and in particular to accept Mr. Butler's reference to the Metaphysics Λ. chapters vii. and viii. as the passage chiefly in Dante's mind. For here Aristotle asserts that the first cause of all is eternal and unmoveable, and yet is the source of all motion, and he adduces in particular the motions of the heavenly bodies as being thus caused. (Compare the term *sustanzie sempiterne* here, especially as glossed by Conv. II. ch. v. *init.*, and again by the explanation given of *solo intendendo*, in Conv. II. vi. *ad fin.* See also Conv. II. iv. ll. 16–30.) And in the previous chapter Aristotle explains that this first cause originates all the motions of the universe as their final, rather than efficient cause, and adds κινεῖ δὲ ὡς

ἐρώμενον (1072 b. 3); with which compare the expression *primo amore* here, and also Par. xxiv. 130–2:

Io credo in uno Iddio
Solo ed eterno, che tutto il ciel move,
Non moto, con amore e con disio.

This at any rate shows Dante to have been familiar with those passages in Aristotle to which we assume him to be indirectly referring in the passage before us.

(23)

De Mon. I. xiv. init., and **l. 15.** **Quaestio**, § 13, **l. 35** (both quotations given *infra*).

The following declaration of Aristotle, though not explicitly given as a quotation by Dante, is so clearly reproduced in the above passages that we can scarcely doubt the source from which he derived it. In De Part. Anim. III. iv. (665 b. 14, 15) we read, ἀρχὴν δὲ τούτων ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι μίαν· ὅπου γὰρ ἐνδέχεται, μίαν βέλτιον ἢ πολλάς. We may compare with this Phys. VII. vi. (259 a. 8–12). In De Mon. I. xiv. *init.* Dante assumes this principle:—'Et quod potest fieri per unum, melius est per unum fieri quam per plura.' The same sentiment is repeated a little below in ll. 15–18 of the same chapter. It is interesting to observe that this is one of the many parallelisms of quotation between the Quaestio and the undoubted works of Dante, for in § 13, l. 34, the same principle is assumed:—'quia quod potest fieri per unum, melius est quod fiat per unum quam per plura.'

(24)

Par. xiii. 97–102.

Non per saper lo numero in che enno
Li motor di quassù, o se *necesse*
Con contingente mai *necesse* fenno;
Non *si est dare primum motum esse*,
O se del mezzo cerchio far si puote
Triangol sì ch' un retto non avesse.

Of the four specimens given here by Dante of purely speculative questions which Solomon is commended for post-

poning to the desire for practical wisdom, the first three are evidently suggested by Aristotle, and the first possibly also by Plato (in view of the passage in Conv. II. v. ll. 21 *seqq.*), while the last is a well-known geometrical theorem (Euclid, iii. 31). As to the first, in the Convito *l. c.*, Dante compares the views of Aristotle and Plato on the subject of the 'primi movitori,' referring to two, as he thinks, somewhat inconsistent utterances of the former in the De Coelo and in the Metaphyics (see references in Index); while as to Plato, Dante seems to be referring to the Timaeus, p. 39 E. and 40 A. The second problem, whether from a syllogism with one necessary and one contingent premiss the conclusion can ever be otherwise than contingent, is discussed by Aristotle in the Prior Analytics, I. xvi. The third problem, whether Motion is eternal or not, is dealt with by Aristotle in Phys. VIII. ch. i. and ii, and he determines, in opposition to Plato, that both Time and Motion are eternal (see especially p. 251, b. 10–15). For Plato's views on this subject, see Timaeus, 37 D, 38 B, &c.

(25)

Par. xiii. 124–126. E di ciò sono al mondo aperte prove
Parmenide, Melisso, Brisso e molti
I quali andavano, e non sapean dove.

Also **De Mon. III. iv. l. 30 seqq.** Quae duo Philosophus obiciebat contra Parmenidem et Melissum, dicens: 'Qui falsa recipiunt, et non syllogizantes sunt.'

By putting together different passages (chiefly three) of Aristotle, we have the source of Dante's selection of these three names as types of false reasoners clearly disclosed. In Phys. III. i. (186 a. 7 *seqq.*), which Dante definitely quotes in De Mon. *l. c.* (though not quite accurately, since Aristotle's words are *καὶ γὰρ ψευδῆ λαμβάνουσι καὶ ἀσυλλόγιστοί εἰσιν αὐτῶν οἱ λόγοι*), Parmenides and Melissus are held up as examples of *ἐριστικῶς συλλογίζοντες*. To this we may add a passage in the De Coelo, III. i. (quoted by Mr. Butler) p. 298, b. 17, where Aristotle, speaking somewhat less harshly of them (*εἰ καὶ τἆλλα λέγουσι καλῶς*), says that they were

misled by attaching undue importance (as we might say) 'to things of sense,' 'διὰ τὸ μηθὲν ἀλλὸ παρὰ τὴν τῶν αἰσθητῶν οὐσίαν ὑπολαμβάνειν εἶναι.' Both these philosophers are frequently mentioned with unfavourable criticism by Aristotle; Bryson not quite so often, but he is spoken of with great severity in Soph. Elench. xi. (171 b. 16 *seqq.*, 172 a. 4) as not only a misguided, but a deliberately dishonest reasoner. His argument was not only 'ἐριστικός,' but 'ἀπατητικὸς καὶ ἄδικος.' It was therefore pre-eminently a case in which

l' affetto lo intelletto lega (l. 120).

And we know that Dante was acquainted with the Soph. Elench., because in the De Mon., in the sentence preceding that which is quoted above, he makes a definite quotation from that work (§ 18).

It may be worth while to note that in the arrangement of these three philosophers in one group with the two heretics Sabellius and Arius in another, we have an instance of Dante's favourite practice of balancing religious and secular, sacred and profane, examples, of which all his works, and especially the Purgatorio, afford very numerous illustrations.

(26)

De Mon. I. xii. ll. 11–16. Quemadmodum tota die Logici nostri faciunt de quibusdam propositionibus, quae ad exemplum logicalibus interseruntur, puta de hac: Triangulus habet tres duobus rectis aequales.

In this passage Dante seems only to mean that the persons whom he is censuring use words as mere counters without attaching any more meaning to them than logicians do to the propositions which they employ in illustration of their rules. The very great frequency with which Aristotle uses this example *passim*, and in his logical works in particular, makes it probable that it was thus suggested to Dante, as well as to the 'Logici nostri' of whom he is actually speaking. It seems out of place, therefore, to refer (as Dr. Witte does) to a work so out of the way as the Magna Moralia, one with which Dante, at any rate, shows no acquaintance else-

where; especially as in the passage cited by Dr. Witte from the Magna Moralia (1183 b. 1–3) the author is giving an example of what would be a ridiculous use of this proposition in an argument. Nothing of this sort seems to be intended in the context of Dante.

(27)

De Mon. III. xv. ll. 56–59. Verum et falsum ab esse rei, vel non esse, in oratione causatur, ut doctrina Praedicamentorum nos docet.

The statement here made, on the authority of the 'doctrina Praedicamentorum,' is apparently derived from Aristotle, Categ. c. 12 (14 b. 18–22), *ἔστι δὲ ὁ μὲν ἀληθὴς λόγος οὐδαμῶς αἴτιος τοῦ εἶναι τὸ πρᾶγμα, τὸ μέντοι πρᾶγμα φαίνεται πῶς αἴτιον τοῦ εἶναι ἀληθῆ τὸν λόγον· τῷ γὰρ εἶναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἢ μὴ ἀληθὴς ὁ λόγος ἢ ψευδὴς λέγεται.*

The 'Categories,' it will be noted, are again quoted under the title of 'Praedicamenta' in the Quaestio, § 2. That Dante sometimes exhibits a knowledge of their contents appears from the Index, but they are not elsewhere cited by name.

The next two passages involve some difficulty as to the accuracy of the reference.

(28)

Conv. IV. ix. ll. 57 seqq. E perchè noi volessimo che 'l sillogismo con falsi principii conchiudesse verità dimostrando, non conchiuderebbe.

Dante is here giving some typical illustrations of impossibilities. They are (1) that heavy bodies should naturally rise instead of falling; (2) that a true conclusion should be proved from false premisses; (3) that a sloping building should be as firm as an upright one. The first two are evidently Aristotelian: that heavy bodies should rise, and fire burn downwards being quite stock instances of impossibilities with Aristotle. There can be little doubt as to the second, though we are met with the difficulty that Dante seems *prima facie* to contradict Aristotle, who states in fact, as we might expect,

the reverse of this. See Prior. Anal. II. ii. *init.* (53 b. 8–10), *ἐξ ἀληθῶν μὲν οὖν [sc. προτάσεων] οὐκ ἔστι ψεῦδος συλλογίσασθαι· ἐκ ψευδῶν δ' ἔστιν ἀληθές, πλὴν οὐ διότι ἀλλ' ὅτι. τοῦ γὰρ διότι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξ ψευδῶν συλλογισμός.* Also again *ib.* l. 26, *Ἐκ ψευδῶν δὲ ἀληθές ἐστι συλλογίσασθαι, καὶ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν προτάσεων ψευδῶν ὄντων καὶ τῆς μιᾶς, κ.τ.λ.* But though an error of memory might explain in Dante, as in any writer, an inaccuracy or error in quotation, yet it would not account for Dante giving as an instance of an impossibility a case which any one can see is quite possible, and of common occurrence. I suppose, therefore, some stress must be laid on the word *dimostrando*, so as to imply something like the limitation made by Aristotle in the words *πλὴν οὐ διότι ἀλλ' ὅτι*, i. e. the *fact* might happen to be true, but the *reason* for it would not be rightly given. The first part of the passage in Aristotle seems to be repeated though not directly quoted by Dante in De Mon. III. ii. l. 17: 'Impossibile enim est in necessariis consequentiis falsum esse consequens, antecedente non falso existente.'

(29)

Conv. II. xiv. ll. 143 seqq. Per che Pittagora, secondochè dice Aristotile nel primo della [*Meta*]*fisica*, poneva i principii delle cose naturali lo pari e lo dispari, &c.

This reference is to the Metaphysics, A. 5 (986 a. 16–21) but all the MSS. read *Fisica*. Giuliani boldly inserts *Metafisica*. I do not think we are quite justified in making this change in the teeth of MS. evidence, without at any rate indicating (as above) that the change is conjectural. Ordinarily I should not in such a case have interfered with the MS. reading, though erroneous, or have considered such a conjectural correction legitimate at all, because, as I have remarked before, Dante's memory is not infallible. But in this case, (1) his knowledge of these two works of Aristotle was such that he would not be likely to make this mistake; and (2) we can see a reason for a copyist who had no such knowledge making the alterations through a mistaken association of ideas derived from the context, the whole subject of

which is 'scienza naturale' and this would seem *prima facie* much more appropriate to Physics than to Metaphysics.

I will next take a series of passages which show how closely Dante followed Aristotle in his explanation of *physical* phenomena. Indeed, as we learn from the passage in Conv. III. v. ll. 59 *seqq.*, which has already been quoted (p. 92), Dante would consider it almost presumptuous to differ from him, and, as we might add, something like impertinence even to require proof of his assertions. This, it will be remembered, occurs in reference to the very fundamental fact of Cosmical Physics, that the earth is the centre of the Universe, and that it does not move. But in reference to numerous physical and meteorological phenomena in detail, Dante's language can only be fully understood by a reference to Aristotle, and sometimes in fact it is scarcely even intelligible without it. We cannot, indeed, always be sure that he is quoting direct from Aristotle, since so very much of Aristotle's teaching on these subjects is embodied by later writers, and especially by Albertus Magnus. His work De Meteoris in particular, was familiar to Dante, who borrows from it on occasions both with and without acknowledgement. In any case Aristotle is the ultimate source of Dante's teaching on these subjects, and in many cases certainly the direct source, since he is often explicitly and accurately quoted.

(30)

Par. i. 139–141. Maraviglia sarebbe . . . .
Come a terra quiete in foco vivo.
(And other similar passages.)

I have already noticed in *Textual Criticism*, &c. (p. 440) the interest attaching to this passage, partly from the question of the reading, and partly from the obvious reference (which indeed bears to some extent also on the question of reading) to Aristotle's familiar statement that it is the nature of fire to ascend, as of stones, &c., to descend. This occurs so often in Aristotle, that it will be enough merely to give two refer-

ences to well-known passages, such as Nic. Eth. II. i. § 2 (1103 a. 20), and Phys. II. i. (192 b. 36). It is curious to note what a very favourite idea this was with Dante. See the list of passages quoted in the Index under Aristotle, Nic. Eth. II. i. 2.

(31)

Conv. III. c. iii.

In this chapter Dante reproduces the teaching, and often almost the language, of Aristotle, as found in several different places. These I will bring together here as affording the explanation of several of Dante's dogmatic statements in this context.

Dante first lays it down that the several elements (*corpora semplici*) have a natural tendency, *al loro loco proprio*, whence earth gravitates to the centre (comp. Inf. xxxii. 73–4, xxxiv. 111) and fire rises to the sphere of the moon (comp. Par. i. 115). This *loco proprio* would be illustrated from Aristotle, De Coelo, I. viii. (277 b. 14), *τριῶν γὰρ ὄντων τῶν σωματικῶν στοιχείων, τρεῖς ἔσονται καὶ οἱ τόποι τῶν στοιχείων ;* and also from Meteor. II. ii. (355 a. 35), *ἄλογον γὰρ εἰ μή τίς ἐστι τόπος ὕδατος ὥσπερ τῶν ἄλλων στοιχείων.* The association of fire with the sphere of the moon occurs in a curious passage of De Gen. Anim. III. xi (761 b. 13–21), where, after connecting plants with the earth, aquatic animals with water, and land animals with air, Aristotle says that we have here no class of creatures associated with fire, *ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸ τοιοῦτον γένος ζητεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς σελήνης.* So, shortly afterwards, when Dante describes plants as *prime animate*, he seems to be copying Hist. Anim. VIII. i. (588 b. 6), *μετὰ γὰρ τὸ τῶν ἀψύχων γένος τὸ τῶν φυτῶν πρῶτόν ἐστιν.*

(32)

Conv. IV. xxiii. l. 113. Secondo li quattro combinatori delle contrarie qualitadi che sono nella nostra composizione, &c.

Compare Aristotle, De Gen. et Cor. II. ii. (*fin.*) and iii. (*init.*) (330 a. 24–b. 7).

Though Dante expressly quotes the Meteora (see below) of Albertus Magnus for the application of these statements made

at the end of the paragraph, we can scarcely doubt that here he has in mind the paragraph from Aristotle, De Gen. et Cor., above cited, which is rather too long to quote. In that passage we have four διαφοραί, also called στοιχεῖα, i.e. heat, cold, dryness, and moisture, which = Dante's *contrarie qualitadi*; and the four συζεύξεις of these στοιχεῖα, taken two and two together = the 'quattro combinatori' of this passage (omitting out of the possible six combinations the practically impossible combinations of two contraries), which correspond with the four elements, as we call them (and Aristotle also sometimes calls them στοιχεῖα). These are here described as ἁπλᾶ σώματα, viz.: fire (dry + hot), air (hot + moist), water (moist + cold), and earth (cold + dry). Then follows in the text of Dante the further application of these results to the four different ages of man which is attributed to Albertus, Meteora, Bk. iv. The passage referred to is really found (as Mr. Paget Toynbee has pointed out) in Albertus, De Juventute et Senectute, Tract i. c. 2 (*med.*). Dante's memory has played him a little false here, being probably mislead by the fact that Meteor. Bk. iv. contains a good deal about 'humidum,' &c., though not the particular statements here quoted.

With this should also be compared Brunetto Latini, Tesoro, ii. c. 31: *Come tutte le cose furo fatte del mischiamento delle complessioni.* It amounts briefly to this: ὕλη was created in the beginning, as a 'grossa materia . . . sanza forma e sanza figura.' Out of this ὕλη were made four elements, two light (fire and air), and two heavy (earth and water), but all partaking of these two 'qualities' (complessioni) as well as of the other two, viz. moist and dry, in different degrees (i.e. air is light, but some air is lighter and some less light, and so of the others). In c. 32 these 'complessioni' are further discussed, the word 'qualitadi' being sometimes used as an equivalent term.

Thus 'complessioni,' or 'qualitadi' (B. Latini) = 'contrarie qualitadi' (Dante *l. c.*) = τέτταρα στοιχεῖα, also called διαφοραί (Aristotle). Again, elementa (B. Latini) = quattro combinatori delle contrarie qualitadi (Dante) = τέτταρες τῶν στοιχείων συζεύξεις, also ἁπλᾶ σώματα, and sometimes also στοιχεῖα (Aristotle).

Brunetto goes on to observe (c. 31 and 32) that in man and other created things the same mixture, in different degrees, both of the 'elementa' and of the 'complessioni' or 'qualitadi' takes place. This statement does not apply to the stars, 'che sono di tutto et in tutto di natura di fuoco.' Dante seems obscurely to imply something like this in the extremely difficult passage in Par. vii. 121 *seqq.*, 139–143, and to infer therefrom the immortality of the human soul (l. 145). See further, Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 36 *seqq.*

(33)

Quaestio, § 20, ll. 53 seqq (quoted *infra*).

Compare De Mundo, iii. (392 b. 35–393 a. 4): *πέντε δὴ στοιχεῖα ταῦτα ἐν πέντε χώραις σφαιρικῶς ἐγκείμενα, περιεχομένης ἀεὶ τῆς ἐλάττονος τῇ μείζονι (λέγῳ δὲ γῆς μὲν ἐν ὕδατι, ὕδατος δὲ ἐν ἀέρι, ἀέρος δὲ ἐν πυρί, πυρὸς δὲ ἐν αἰθέρι) τὸν ὅλον κόσμον συνεστήσατο.*

This passage seems evidently to have suggested Quaestio, § 20, l. 52, where having argued that neither earth, water, air, or fire can be the cause of the elevation of different parts of the earth's surface, the author adds—'quum non restet ulterius (so we should probably read for *alterius*) nisi coelum, reducendus est hic effectus in ipsum, tanquam in causam propriam.' *Coelum* is evidently used here as equivalent to *αἰθήρ*, as the fifth element. Indeed Aristotle more than once says that the two terms are interchangeable. See especially the chapter before that quoted above (392 a. 5)—*οὐρανοῦ δὲ καὶ ἄστρων οὐσίαν μὲν αἰθέρα καλοῦμεν.* (See supplementary note *infra*.)

(34)

Conv. II. iii. l. 19 seqq. Aristotile credette, seguitando solamente l' antica grossezza degli astrologi, che fossero pure otto cieli . . . E questa sua sentenza così erronea può vedere chi vuole nel secondo *di Cielo e Mondo*[1].

This proved rather a difficult reference to identify. There seems to be no one passage in the De Coelo, Bk. ii, in which

[1] The words added in the text, 'che è nel secondo de' Libri naturali,' look like a gloss, since Dante very often refers to the De Coelo without any such addition. But whether or no, they seem to refer to the arrangement of the Aristotelian treatises by Albertus Magnus; see tom. ii. ed. 1651, and also Jourdain, *Traductions*, &c., p. 32.

Aristotle definitely fixes the number of celestial spheres at eight. Still Dante is quite justified in attributing to him this opinion by an obvious inference from certain passages in this Book, and especially in c. xii; the same, be it observed, from which Dante quotes, a few lines lower down, Aristotle's account of the occultation of Mars. Immediately after that description, Aristotle propounds the question (292 a. 10 *seqq.*) why it is that *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ φόρᾳ τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν ἄστρων πλῆθος ὥστε τῶν ἀναριθμήτων εἶναι δοκεῖν τὴν πᾶσαν τάξιν, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἓν χωρὶς ἕκαστον, δύο δὲ ἢ πλείω οὐ φαίνεται ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐνδεδεμένα φορᾷ*. This question is dealt with later on, and we need not happily now concern ourselves with the difficulties of interpretation involved, since the passage quoted clearly involves the opinion attributed by Dante to Aristotle, viz. that there are only eight *φοραί*, i. e. orbits, or, as Dante would say, 'heavens'; viz. one of the fixed stars and one for each of the 'seven planets[1].' Further Dante pleads that Aristotle is here following 'solamente l'antica grossezza degli astrologi' (l. 20). This might be justified by the language of Aristotle in c. x. of this Book, where in introducing this part of the subject, he says, *ἐκ τῶν περὶ ἀστρολογίαν θεωρείσθω· λέγεται γὰρ ἱκανῶς* (291 a. 31); and again in c. xii. (292 a. 7–9), where the authority of the Egyptians and Babylonians is given for a statement. Hence the expression of Dante first quoted, which serves still further to prove that c. xii. was the place which Dante had in view when citing 'il secondo *di Cielo e Mondo*.' Dante adds that in Metaph. XII. Aristotle explicitly excuses himself from responsibility by alleging a similar authority for the assertions which he thus merely repeats. This passage is easily identified at p. 1073 b. 3 *seqq.* It is probable that without this loophole of escape Dante would have scarcely ventured thus to criticize 'il Filosofo.' Moreover in the next chapter Dante points out that besides the ninth heaven which is rendered necessary by the subsequent observations

[1] There is a passage even more explicit in De Mundo, c. ii. (392 a. 16 *seqq.*), which may be compared, but the definite reference to the De Coelo et Mundo excludes it from consideration here, nor does Dante (as far as I know) ever mention the De Mundo, though I think he sometimes refers to it. See note on Par. xiii. 61 (p. 110).

of Ptolemy (Conv. II. iii. l. 36), 'i Cattolici' and 'la santa Chiesa' have further taught us that there is a tenth heaven, which is the abode of God Himself[1]. And it is interesting to note that he endeavours to show (ch. iv. l. 33) that Aristotle

[1] See *sup.* under Vulgate, No. 39.

A brief explanation of the point at issue between Aristotle and Dante (i. e. Ptolemy) as to the existence of eight or nine heavens (apart from the tenth, which we owe to Revelation) may perhaps be acceptable. To account for the motions of the heavenly bodies, so far as they had been observed in the time of Aristotle, eight systems of revolutions, *φοραί*, or, in later phraseology, 'heavens,' were sufficient. The earth was the fixed centre (see Conv. III. v.) around which the 'seven planets' (including the sun and moon) revolved each with its own peculiar motion, or carried round in a 'heaven' of its own. The fixed stars were all carried round with a common motion or heaven, which made the eighth. But the discovery, probably by Hipparchus, of another motion before undetected, viz. the precession of the Equinoxes, i.e. a retrograde movement of the fixed stars themselves in longitude, implied a slow revolution of their heaven from W. to E. contrary in direction to those already recognized (Conv. II. vi. ll. 140 *seqq.*, and 15. ll. 102–104). The amount of this resulting from the actual observations attributed to Hipparchus, as compared with modern data, would give (though there is no evidence of Hipparchus having worked out the result) an amount of nearly 50″ annually, a result very near indeed to the truth, though Ptolemy later made it only 36″. Hence comes the amount of this *movimento quasi insensibile* assigned by Dante, viz. one degree in 100 years, which, like most other information of this kind, he doubtless derived from Alfraganus (Elem. Astron. c. xiii.). It would therefore take 3,600 years to complete the whole circumference. Next, as to the effect of this discovery on the number of the spheres or heavens. Hipparchus is said to have supposed that besides the diurnal revolution attributed to the eighth sphere, that of the fixed stars, it was also affected by this retrograde motion about the poles of the ecliptic. Ptolemy (reasonably enough) attributed the same retrograde motion to the seven planetary spheres also. But some of the Arabian astronomers separated these two motions and attributed to the eighth sphere only the slow motion of precession, while the diurnal revolution was transferred to another and a ninth external sphere governing and controlling the motions of all the others, and called the *Primum Mobile*. Dante, it is true (Conv. II. iii. ll. 36 *seqq.*), distinctly ascribes this 'discovery' to Ptolemy, who objected 'on philosophical principles' to the final and highest sphere being supposed to have complicated movements, and therefore declared the existence of a 'primo mobile semplicissimo.' It is probable, however, that the distinction between the views actually held by Ptolemy and those added by his Arabian translators and commentators was not always accurately maintained, as we find to be the case with Arabian translators of Aristotle.

Dante himself, in Conv. II. xv. ll. 95 *seqq.*, attributes both the diurnal and precessional motion to the eighth sphere, and bases a somewhat fanciful argument upon it. But just below (ll. 132 *seqq.*) he refers the diurnal motion to the ninth sphere, and so he does in II. iv. ll. 10, 19 *seqq.* (compared with c. iii. ll. 45 *seqq.*). In II. vi. ll. 140–143 the precessional motion is assigned to the eighth sphere

seems to have divined, to those who fully understand him, the existence even of this tenth heaven in the De Coelo, Bk. i. (see references in Index).

(35)

Conv. II. xv. ll. 60. seqq. (The 'Old' and 'New' Translations of Aristotle).

This is a highly interesting passage in which Dante refers to Aristotle's opinion as to the nature of the Galaxy as given in Meteor. i. 8, but confesses his inability to declare what that opinion really was on account of the divergence between the 'Old Translation' and the 'New.' This passage is so fully discussed in the Essay on the Translation of Aristotle employed by Dante that it will not be necessary here to do more than give the reference to it.

I might perhaps add a word on the passage a little earlier (l. 45), where Dante attributes to the Pythagoreans the opinion that the Milky Way represented the combustion of a certain part of the heavens which was not calculated to bear the near presence of the sun's heat, on some occasion when the sun wandered there out of its proper course. Dante adds that he believes this notion to have been derived from the fable of Phaethon. This may well have been taken by Dante from the chapter of the Meteor. of Aristotle above cited, where the theory is also connected with the story of Phaethon. Mr. Toynbee has pointed out that Dante's language seems to resemble more closely that of Albertus Magnus, de Meteoris, L. I. Tract ii. c. 2. But, as I have said more than once, it is of course understood always that when quoting Aristotle, Dante must have had recourse to some translation or paraphrase.

(36)

Conv. III. v. l. 29 seqq. (The Earth's position in the universe).

Compare De Coelo, II. xiii. 293 a. 20 to b. 30 (a passage too long to quote).

('stellata sphera'), and it is also said to affect the planets as well as the fixed stars (see Ptolemy's opinion noticed *supra*).

[For several assertions here made see Narrien's Origin and Progress of Astronomy, pp. 223–224, 301, 304].

This passage (or some version or paraphrase of it) has certainly been the source from which Dante derived the information about Pythagoras and Plato in Conv. III. v. l. 29 *seqq.* Dante in fact practically acknowledges this in ll. 53 *seqq.* Two points may be specially noticed. Dante evidently is not aware that *Antictona* is an accusative inflexion, since he gives it as a proper name in this form. He was probably misled by the words ἦν ἀντίχθονα ὄνομα καλοῦσιν, or by some transliteration of the word in question. The other point is that in the Quaestio de Aqua et Terra (which to my mind has strong internal evidence at any rate of genuineness) we twice find a portion of this passage reproduced almost *verbatim*, though no quotation is actually acknowledged. See § 4 *init.*, 'Nobiliori corpori debetur nobilior locus.' The same words are repeated in § 23, l. 14. Compare De Coelo, II. xiii. (293 a. 30), τῷ γὰρ τιμιωτάτῳ οἴονται προσήκειν τὴν τιμιωτάτην ὑπάρχειν χώραν. In the Quaestio *l.c.* this is applied to Water as compared with Earth. In Aristotle it is applied to the superiority of Fire, and this is the way in which Dante employs the principle in Conv. III. v. l. 37 *seqq.*

(37)

Quaestio, § 13.

The diagram and the argument based upon it in this section of the Quaestio are taken almost directly from De Coelo, II. iv (287 b. 4–14). Compare especially with the expression 'aqua gibbi dilabetur, donec coaequetur ad D cum circumferentia centrali sive regulari,' the following:—ὥστε περιρρεύσεται τὸ ὕδωρ ἕως ἂν ἰσασθῇ . . . σφαιροειδὴς ἄρα ἡ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπιφάνεια.

(38)

Quaestio, § 21, ll. 44–46.

The author is here arguing that the uplifting of the earth out of the water is due to the influence of the stars, either operating in the way of attraction, like that of a magnet, or else by generating vapours, which apparently cause the earth to swell out into 'montuositates' in places, so that, in fact, 'the earth has bubbles as the water hath.' If this be his meaning, the idea was probably derived from Aristotle,

Meteor. II. viii. (366 b. 15 to 367 a. 4). Aristotle compares these pent-up winds in the bowels of the earth to flatulency in animals, and he traces their effects either in earthquakes (and this is noticed elsewhere as having probably been in Dante's mind at Purg. xxi. 56[1]), or in the formation of volcanic islands or hills. Note especially 367 a. 3, *ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐξανῳδει τι τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἀνήει οἷον λοφώδης ὄγκος μετὰ ψόφου.*

I will next draw attention to passages in Dante relating to various meteorological phenomena, and to the explanations which he gives of them.

In regard to the references following to the Meteorologica of Aristotle, it should be premised that Dante never directly quotes that work by name, unless we admit the genuineness of the Quaestio, where two such citations occur (§§ 6 and 23). A work, *della Meteora*, is quoted twice in the Convito, viz. IV. xxiii. l. 125[2], where it is ascribed to Albertus Magnus; and again in II. xiv. l. 169, where no author is mentioned, but there can be little doubt that the same work is referred to. For, as Mr. Paget Toynbee has pointed out, the apparently direct citation of Albumassar[3] immediately following in that context is derived (though without acknowledgement) from Albertus, De Meteoris, Bk. I. Tr. iv. c. 9, and there is ample evidence besides of Dante's acquaintance with the work. I suspect, therefore, that in many of the references which follow to the Meteorologica of Aristotle, Dante may have derived his knowledge second-hand from the treatise of Albertus. His paraphrases of this and similar works of Aristotle probably took the place for Dante of the Latin Translations, to which he necessarily had recourse when dealing with the works of Aristotle. It must therefore be remembered that when I compare Dante's meteorological theories with passages in Aristotle, I do not commit myself

[1] See *inf.* No. 41.

[2] It is curious too that this is a wrong reference, for (see *sup.* p. 13) the passage is found not in the *De Meteoris*, but in the *De Iuventute et Senectute* of Albertus. A little earlier in this chapter (l. 86) Dante has quoted the work of Aristotle which bears the latter title. But most likely he was quoting through Albertus again there.

[3] And, we may add, that of Seneca also.

to the belief that Dante derived them directly from him rather than from Albertus. On Dante's obligations to Albertus Magnus generally, an interesting article will be found by Mr. Paget Toynbee in Romania for July, 1895.

(*a*) On thunder, lightning, and meteors.

(39)

Purg. xxxii. 109–111. Non scese mai con sì veloce moto
Foco di spessa nube, quando piove
Da quel confine che più va remoto.

This seems to refer to the theory of Aristotle explained in Meteor. II. ix. (369 a. 16–24), that thunder and lightning are generated chiefly in the highest regions of the air, because the cold being there most extreme, the clouds are the most dense: *πυκνοτέρας τῆς συστάσεως τῶν νεφῶν γιγνομένης πρὸς τὸ ἔσχατον πέρας*. This has probably suggested to Dante the words, 'quel confine che più va remoto.'

Not only so, but in the same passage Aristotle goes on to explain that the lightning which, as we shall see later, Aristotle regarded as only an ignited vapour or blast, being, as it were, squeezed out by the extreme density of the cloud (*ἀλλ' εἰς τοὐναντίον τῆς πυκνότητος ἀναγκαῖον γίγνεσθαι τὴν ἔκθλιψιν*) *falls downwards*, whereas in all other cases fire and heat *ascend*. He compares this to the way in which a nut, or the stone of fruit, when squeezed between the fingers will, in spite of its weight, shoot upwards. This being so, I have little doubt that Blanc is right in interpreting *piove* in the above passage (l. 110) 'when it *falls*,' not 'when it rains,' as many commentators do. Moreover, it must be observed that the word is more often used in the former sense than in the latter by Dante, as may be seen at once by a reference to the word in Dr. Fay's invaluable Concordance.

(40)

Par. xxiii. 40–42. Come foco di nube si disserra,
Per dilatarsi sì che non vi cape,
E fuor di sua natura in giù s' atterra.

This is another passage which is explained by the same reference to Aristotle's Meteorologica. Dante here not only

refers to the anomaly of lightning falling, but the explanation of it which he gives also recalls the process of ἔκθλιψις described by Aristotle, and, further, the 'unnaturalness' of the phenomenon is also noted by both authors.

(41)

Purg. xxi. 52 seqq. Secco vapor non surge più avante, &c.

In this passage the absence of thunder, lightning, or earthquakes on the Mountain of Purgatory is explained by the fact that *Secco vapor* rises not so far. Here we have evidently a reproduction of Aristotle, Meteor. II. ix. *ad fin.* (370 a. 25 *seqq.*), where ἀναθυμίασις ξηρὰ is stated to be the common cause of wind, lightning, thunder, and earthquakes. Similarly, in l. 56, the *vento che in terra si nasconda* is said to cause earthquakes. This is stated by Aristotle, Meteor. II. viii. (366 b. 15–22), the expression here copied by Dante being ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐναπολαμβανομένη δύναμις, which Aristotle applies primarily to the symptoms of flatulency in the body, adding οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ τὸ πνεῦμα παραπλήσια ποιεῖ. (See *supra*, p. 129.)

(42)

Purg. xxviii. 97–99. Perchè il turbar, che sotto da sè fanno
L' esalazion dell' acqua e della terra,
Che quanto posson retro al calor vanno, &c.

This passage, like the last, describes the exemption of the Earthly Paradise from the storms generated on the lower earth by the exhalations which, proceeding from the water and the earth, rise as far as they can, following the heat by which such exhalations are drawn up. This again is little more than a reproduction of Aristotle, Meteor. II. iv. *med.* (360 b. 30–35): ὕσαντός τε γὰρ ἡ γῆ ξηραινομένη ὑπό τε τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ θερμοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄνωθεν ἀναθυμιᾶται, τοῦτο δ' ἦν ἀνέμου σῶμα. When after this the wind drops, rain is formed, παυομένων διὰ τὸ ἀποκρίνεσθαι τὸ θερμὸν ἀεὶ καὶ ἀναφέρεσθαι εἰς τὸν ἄνω τόπον (see also below under 45). And the idea of the elevation of the Mountain of Purgatory securing this exemption in l. 101,

Questo monte salìo verso 'l ciel tanto,

is supported by Meteor. I. iii. (341 a. 1): *φαίνεται . . . οὐχ ὑπερβάλλειν τὰ πνεύματα τῶν ὑψηλοτάτων ὀρῶν.* We might also thus explain the expression *avversi ardori* as the cause of the hurricane in the celebrated passage, Inf. ix. 67 *seqq.*

(43)

Purg. v. 37–39. Vapori accesi non vid' io sì tosto
Di prima notte mai fender sereno,
Nè, sol calando, nuvole d' agosto, &c.

The language of this passage also is to be explained by a reference to Aristotle's theory as to the identity of lightning, meteors, and ignited air. See Meteor. II. ix. (369 a. 10–12): *περὶ δὲ ἀστραπῆς καὶ βροντῆς, ἔτι δὲ περὶ τυφῶνος καὶ πρηστῆρος καὶ κεραυνῶν λέγωμεν· καὶ γὰρ τούτων τὴν αὐτὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπολαμβάνειν δεῖ πάντων.* Besides other passages, note III. i. (371 a. 15–17), where *τυφὼν* and *πρηστὴρ* are distinguished, and the latter is explained to be a flaming meteor[1]. A hurricane (*ἐκνεφίας*), if it take the form of a whirlwind, is *τυφών*, but if it is forced straight downwards and becomes ignited in its course, it is called *πρηστὴρ—ὅταν δὲ κατασπώμενον ἐκπυρωθῇ (τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἂν λεπτότερον τὸ πνεῦμα γένηται) καλεῖται πρηστήρ.* Hence, in this passage of the Purgatorio, we have meteors and summer lightning brought together under the common title *Vapori accesi.* As there is a difference of reading '*prima* notte' and '*mezza* notte,' it may be worth while to support the other arguments for the former, which I have adduced in *Textual Criticism*, &c., p. 378, by a passage which I have since met with in the Meteora of Albertus Magnus, I. Tr. iii. c. 5, where Alfraganus is quoted for the statement that falling stars occur especially 'in crepusculo vespertino.'

(44)

Par. viii. 22 seqq. Di fredda nube non disceser venti,
O visibili o no, tanto festini, &c.

This passage, if not directly quoted from Aristotle's Meteor. III. i., is evidently founded upon it, and is certainly to be explained by it. We may note especially the following passage in

[1] See also other references given under the next passage discussed.

Meteor. III. i. (370 b. 32): . . . *τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ νέφους στρέφεται μὲν κύκλῳ τὸ πρῶτον διὰ τὴν εἰρημένην αἰτίαν, φέρεται δὲ κάτω διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ τὰ νέφη πυκνοῦσθαι, ᾗ ἐκπίπτει τὸ θερμόν· καλεῖται δ', ἂν ἀχρωμάτιστον ᾖ, τοῦτο τὸ πάθος τυφών*, κ.τ.λ. Hence we recognize (1) the descent of the storm from the cloud; (2) the presence of cold as the cause; and (3) the curious expression *ἀχρωμάτιστον*, explaining the insertion of the words 'o visibili o no.' For Aristotle held lightning to be simply wind rendered visible by ignition. See the preceding chapter, Meteor. II. ix. (369 b. 6), *καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἣν καλοῦμεν ἀστραπήν, ᾗ ἂν ὥσπερ ἐκπῖπτον τὸ πνεῦμα χρωματισθὲν ὀφθῇ*; and, again, De Mundo, c. iv. (395 a. 15), *πυρωθὲν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ λάμψαν ἀστραπὴ λέγεται*[1]. Hence Dante's simile, when interpreted by Aristotle, includes the comparison of swift motion to either lightning or hurricane, i. e. *venti visibili o no.* It will be observed that several quotations show the familiarity of Dante with this particular portion of Aristotle.

(β) The phenomena of rain.

(45)

Purg. v. 109-111. Ben sai come nell' aere si raccoglie
Quell' umido vapor che in acqua riede,
Tosto che sale dove il freddo il coglie[2].

Conv. IV. xviii. l. 40. Il freddo è generativo dell' acqua.

In these passages Dante describes, almost in the language of Aristotle, the formation of rain in consequence of moist exhalations rising so high that they encounter cold and are condensed. We may compare this with Meteor. II. iv. (360 b. 30–35), already quoted, *sup.* p. 131, and Meteor. I. ix. (346 b. 26–31), and especially the words, '*συνίσταται πάλιν ἡ ἀτμὶς ψυχομένη διά τε τὴν ἀπόλειψιν τοῦ θερμοῦ καὶ τὸν τόπον, καὶ γίνεται ὕδωρ ἐξ ἀέρος· γενόμενον δὲ φέρεται πάλιν πρὸς τὴν γῆν.*' And, indeed, many other similar passages might be quoted. One only may perhaps be added, De Gen. et Corr. II. iv. (331 a. 29), *πάλιν δὲ ἐξ ἀέρος [ἔσται] ὕδωρ, ἐὰν κρατηθῇ τὸ θερμὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ψυχροῦ*. In Purg. v. 109, the words *Ben sai come*, by

[1] Add Meteor. II. ix. *fin.* (370 a. 25 *seqq.*) *ἡμεῖς δέ φαμεν τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι φύσιν ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς γῆς ἄνεμον, ἐν δὲ τῇ γῇ σεισμόν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς νέφεσι βροντήν.* See also the last passage discussed.

[2] See suppl. note on ll. 115–8, *infra.*

which the passage is introduced, may very likely refer to the well-known authority of Aristotle, presupposed by Dante in his readers here, as at Inf. xi. 79, 80:—

> Non ti rimembra di quelle parole,
> Colle quai la tua Etica pertratta, &c.;

and also *ib.* l. 101,

> E se tu ben la tua Fisica note, &c.

Observe, too, that we have the three words *συνίσταται*, *ἀτμίς*, and *ὕδωρ*, occurring in 360 b. 35, all represented in Purg. v. 109, 110.

(46)

Purg. xxviii. 121–3. L' acqua che vedi non surge di vena
Che ristori vapor che giel converta,
Come fiume ch' acquista e perde lena.

Here we seem to have a reminiscence of Aristotle's theory in Meteor. I. xiii. (349 b. 21 *seqq.*), of the production of springs (*vena*) and rivers, in part at least, through the condensation of vapour by subterranean cold, as well as by that in the upper regions of the air.

(γ) Solar and lunar halos, rainbows, &c.

(47)

Par. xxviii. 22–24 and 32–33.

Quanto pare appresso
Alo cinger la luce che il dipigne,
Quando il vapor che il porta più è spesso.
. . . . . .
Il messo di Juno
Intero a contenerlo sarebbe arto.

These passages should be compared with Aristotle's Meteor. III. c. ii. and iii. We note (1) that Dante follows Aristotle in attributing solar and lunar halos to the density of the air; see Meteor. III. iii. *sub init.* (372 b. 15–18, and 23, 24). (2) That as Aristotle discusses together the phenomena of halos and rainbows, their causes being mainly identical, c. ii. *init.* (371 b. 18–20), so Dante here draws comparisons from both in the same context. (3) Aristotle contrasts these phenomena in

that the former often exhibits a complete circle, while the latter is never seen complete (371 b. 23 and 26). Dante incidentally refers to the incomplete circle of the latter in l. 32:—

Che il messo di Juno
Intero a contenerlo sarebbe arto;

and the complete circle of the former, in the words:—

Alo *cinger* la luce che il dipigne (l. 23).

(48)

Conv. II. xiv. l. 167. Li quali (vapori) per loro medesimi molte volte s' accendono, siccome nel primo della *Meteora* è determinato.

I ought, perhaps, hardly to cite this passage here, since it is almost certainly not (as I once thought) the Meteorologica of Aristotle, but the Meteora or de Meteoris of Albertus Magnus that Dante is referring to. There are, however, several passages in the first Book of the treatise of Aristotle that might have justified such a reference, e.g. I. iii. (340 b. 13); I. iv. (341 b. 23 *seq.*); I. v. (342 b. 1), &c.: still I have no doubt that Dante is really referring to the work of Albertus. For note (1) the impersonal character of the reference. The language is not attributed to Aristotle, or to 'il filosofo.' (2) I have already observed that (except, perhaps, in the Quaestio) Dante never quotes by name the Meteorologica of Aristotle (see p. 129). (3) He does quote the Meteora of Albertus at any rate in Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 125, 126, quite definitely. (4) The chapter in that treatise (Lib. I. Tr. iv. c. 8), which seems likely to be the source of this quotation, is the very one from which (as Mr. Paget Toynbee pointed out in the Academy, July, 1894) Dante derived the story of Alexander's experiences in India, described in Inf. xiv. 31; and the next chapter (Lib. I. Tr. iv. c. 9) is that from which he borrows, without acknowledgement, the statements about Albumassar and Seneca, which follow in the next sentence to that which we are now discussing (see *sup.*, pp. 13, 129).

We proceed next to show how Dante was no less entirely beholden to Aristotle for his *physiology*.

(49)

In the difficult passage on the development of the embryo, in Purg. xxv., which is for some curious reason put into the mouth of Statius[1], almost every line is a reproduction of some statement or theory of Aristotle in the De Gen. Anim. It would be too long to illustrate this in detail, but any one who will take the trouble to go through the passages cited in the Index will find a running commentary on line after line, and one expression after another acquires quite a new significance when read in this light. Mr. Butler (to whom I am indebted for several references here) has printed a considerable number of these illustrative passages in his translation of Purgatorio, p. 319.

There are, however, four places which may be singled out for a brief special notice.

(*a*) l. 46:—

> Ivi s' accoglie l' uno e l' altro (*sc.* sangue) insieme.

Here, as Mr. Butler remarks, the reading *insieme* is conclusively established (though indeed it scarcely stands in need of the support) as against *in seme*, by the theory of Aristotle on this subject, strongly and repeatedly insisted on by him in the De Gen. Anim., e.g. I. c. xix, xx, &c. It may also be briefly mentioned that the remarkable expression *sopr' altrui sangue* in the previous line finds its explanation at once in Aristotle's theory respecting the καταμήνια in the same chapters. (See especially 727 a. 2 and 25; 737 a. 28.) The same idea seems probably to be conveyed by the singular expression οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων . . . . ἐγεννήθησαν in St. John i. 13.

(*β*) l. 51:—

> Ciò che per sua materia fe' constare.

Here there is an interesting variation in the reading. We find besides *constare*, also *gestare* and *gustare*, the latter being one of the variants characteristic of the 'Vatican family' of MSS. (see *Textual Criticism*, App. II). But no one who

[1] On this see *supra*, p. 32.

observes the frequent repetition by Aristotle of the word *συνίστησι* in reference to the circumstances here described can hesitate as to the adoption of *constare*. See *inter alia*, II. iii. (737 a. 21); II. iv. (739 a. 7, b. 20), and many similar passages.

(γ) ll. 53–56.

The passage of the human soul through the preliminary stages of those of a plant and of a mere animal is the doctrine taught by Aristotle in several passages (see references in Index, *h. l.*). But more particularly Dante's reference to the *fungo marino* in l. 56 may have been suggested by another passage in Hist. Anim. VIII. i. (588 b. 13), where these creatures are described as holding just the ambiguous position between plants and animals which Dante assigns here to the *foetus*:—*ἔνια γὰρ τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ διαπορήσειεν ἄν τις πότερον ζῷόν ἐστιν ἢ φυτόν*. It may be noted that Dante appears to refer to this chapter on two other occasions, so that he was probably familiar with it. See Conv. II. ix. l. 78, and III. iii. l. 21.

(δ) ll. 40, 41; 59, 60.

The importance here attached to the heart as the source and initial point of the life of the embryo and of its several parts and functions is also based on the theory of Aristotle, not only as it may be inferred from the passages cited in the Index in reference to ll. 37–39, but as explicitly declared in such places as the following:—II. iv. (738 b. 16), *ἀρχὴ γὰρ τῆς φύσεως ἡ καρδία καὶ τὸ ἀνάλογον*. Comp. 735 a. 23–26: *ὥστε εἰ ἡ καρδία πρῶτον ἔν τισι ζῴοις γίγνεται, ἐν δὲ τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσι καρδίαν τὸ ταύτῃ ἀνάλογον, ἐκ ταύτης ἂν εἴη ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῖς ἔχουσι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἐκ τοῦ ἀναλόγου*. Similar language occurs in 741 b. 15, &c.

(50)

Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 30 seqq.

The theory of generation which is expounded by Dante in a difficult passage in Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 30 *seqq.*, following, as he expressly states, the opinion of Aristotle and the Peripatetics, should be compared throughout with the very similar discussion in Purg. xxv. My present purpose is not to attempt

any solution of its difficulties, either in the text or subject-matter, but only to show the use here made by Dante of Aristotle's theories on the subject. The passages being too long to quote in full, I will limit myself to references. Dante asserts (1) that the female supplies the matter or ὕλη, while the male contributes the *virtù formativa* through the seed. These statements will be found in the following among many other passages of the De Gen. Anim. :—716 a. 5–7 ; 727 b. 15 ; 729 b. 12 ; 730 a. 27 ; 737 a. 20–22 ; and we may, perhaps, specially quote 738 b. 20, ἀεὶ δὲ παρέχει τὸ μὲν θῆλυ τὴν ὕλην, τὸ δὲ ἄρρεν τὸ δημιουργοῦν. The *virtù formativa*, as used here and also in Purg. xxv. 41, 59, is well explained by 726 b. 17–19, οἷον ἐκείνων (*sc.* μερῶν) ἕκαστον ἐνεργείᾳ, τοιοῦτον τὸ σπέρμα δυνάμει.

He further states (2) that a living soul is drawn forth from the potentiality of the seed by a *virtù celestiale*. This corresponds with the language of Aristotle, who asserts on the one hand that all seeds of life and all powers of the soul come from celestial heat, which is akin in nature to that of the stars, and yet that in another sense these proceed from the potentiality of the seed. See 735 a. 5–9 ; 736 b. 29 *seqq.*; 737 a. 7 *seqq.* (3) That the Intellect, i. e. in Aristotelian phraseology the *Intellectus Patiens* or *Possibilis* (νοῦς παθητικός), proceeds from a divine source, as is stated, only in more poetical language, in Purg. xxv. 70. This seems to find its counterpart in the well-known declaration of Aristotle, De Gen. Anim. II. iii. (736 b. 27), λείπεται τὸν νοῦν μόνον θύραθεν ἐπεισιέναι, καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον. (Μόνον is here used to exclude the θρεπτικὴ and the αἰσθητικὴ ψυχή.) (4) The declaration (l. 44) that this 'Intelletto possibile . . . . potenzialmente in sè adduce tutte le forme universali' is evidently taken from Aristotle, de Anim. III. iv., and especially 429 a. 27–29, καὶ εὖ δὴ οἱ λέγοντες τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι τόπον εἰδῶν, πλὴν ὅτι οὐχ ὅλη ἀλλ' ἡ νοητική, οὔτε ἐντελεχείᾳ, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει τὰ εἴδη ; and again, *ib.* b. 30, 31, δυνάμει πώς ἐστι τὰ νοητὰ ὁ νοῦς, ἀλλ' ἐντελεχείᾳ οὐδέν, πρὶν ἂν νοῇ.

In regard to the first of the statements here illustrated, Dante, it will be observed, alleges (ll. 37, 38) that the *virtù formativa* is given by 'l' *anima* del generante'; for such is the reading, as far as is known, of all the MSS. Giuliani

deliberately alters this into *cuore* in order to effect a correspondence with Purg. xxv. ll. 40, 41 ; 59, 60 (see *supra*, p. 137). But although Dante *might* have said this here also, there is at present no evidence that he *did*. Also his language as it stands seems to be justified by De Gen. Anim. II. v. (741 a. 6 *seqq.*), where Aristotle discusses the question why the action of the male is necessary for the production of a living embryo. His answer is that there can be no distinction of members (comp. *virtù formativa*) without an *αἰσθητικὴ ψυχή*, and affirms that the male *ἔστι τῆς τοιαύτης ποιητικὸν ψυχῆς*; and again, 741 b. 6, he repeats *ἐμποιεῖ γὰρ τοῦτο* (sc. *τὸ ἄρρεν*) *τὴν αἰσθητικὴν ψυχήν, ἢ δι' αὐτοῦ ἢ διὰ τῆς γονῆς*. Add also II. iii. 737 a. 29, *ἓν γὰρ οὐκ ἔχει* (sc. *τὰ καταμήνια*) *μόνον, τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρχὴν . . . . ταύτην γὰρ τὸ τοῦ ἄρρενος ἐπιφέρει σπέρμα*.

(51)

Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 69 seqq. L' umido radicale . . . il quale è suggetto e nutrimento del calore, che è nostra vita.

With this compare the following passages:—

De Gen. Anim. II. i. §§ 16, 17 (732 b. 31 *seqq.*), *τελεώτερα δὲ τὰ θερμότερα τὴν φύσιν καὶ ὑγρότερα καὶ μὴ γεώδη . . . ζωτικὸν γὰρ τὸ ὑγρόν, πορρωτάτω δὲ τοῦ ἐμψύχου τὸ ξηρόν*.

Also De An. II. iv. *ad fin.* (416 b. 29), *διὸ πᾶν ἔμψυχον ἔχει θερμότητα*.

And De Juv. et Sen. [*al. περὶ ἀναπνοῆς*] c. xviii. (479 a. 29), *Γένεσις μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ πρώτη μέθεξις ἐν τῷ θερμῷ τῆς θρεπτικῆς ψυχῆς, ζωὴ δὲ ἡ μονὴ ταύτης. νεότης δὲ ἔστιν ἡ τοῦ πρώτου καταψυκτικοῦ μορίου αὔξησις*.

Though there is not in the above passage of the Convito an actual quotation of any definite words of Aristotle, there can be little doubt as to the Aristotelian origin of the expressions and theories here adopted by Dante, especially as both the passages above referred to are found in contexts with which Dante shows himself by several other quotations to have been familiar. The last passage seems to be that definitely referred to by Dante in l. 85 ; but when he says that *Giovanezza* is 'accrescimento di *quella*,' we must under-

stand *vita*, which, as will be seen above, is not an accurate reproduction of Aristotle's words.

(52)

Conv. III. ix. ll. 83–87. Da questa pupilla lo spirito visivo, che si continua da essa alla parte del cerebro dinanzi, dov' è la sensibile virtù siccome in principio fontale, subitamente senza tempo la rappresenta, e così vedemo.

See De Part Anim. II. x. (656 b. 16–31)[1].

Comp. Hist. Anim. I. xi. (492 a. 21), *περαίνουσι δὲ καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ εἰς τὸν ἐγκέφαλον.*

The illustrative passage from the De Part. Anim. is too long to quote in full. It may be sufficient to say that it will be found to contain both the statements here made by Dante, viz. that the operation of sight depends on the front part of the brain, and that the eye is physically connected with that part. I refer to this chiefly because it seems to me to establish the correct punctuation to be that which I have adopted above (so also Giuliani), though Frat., Edd. Mil., and others put the comma before, and not after, *dinanzi.*

(53)

Par. xxvii. 137, 138. Della bella figlia
Di quei ch' apporta mane e lascia sera.

Add Par. xxii. 116. Quegli ch' è padre d' ogni mortal vita.

These passages are interesting, because though not direct quotations from Aristotle, they, and especially the former, are almost unintelligible unless familiarity with certain passages in Aristotle be presupposed[2]. At least this is so if we adopt the interpretation which appears to me to be fully established by the reference in question, viz. that 'la bella figlia Di quei ch' apporta mane e lascia sera' is a paraphrastic description of 'human nature,' and not, as some commentators say, 'the moon.' 'Quei' is in any case obviously 'the sun': and if it be correct to say that Dante intended 'human nature' by the daughter of the Sun, we may suppose that he had floating in his memory two passages of Aristotle (cited by Mr. Butler)

[1] But probably here derived from Alb. Magn. *De Sensu et Sensato*, Tr. I. c. 5.

[2] This has already been observed *supra*, p. 18.

where this idea occurs, viz. Phys. II. ii. (194 b. 13), ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον γεννᾷ καὶ ἥλιος. This passage was, we know, familiar to Dante, since he quotes it in De Mon. I. ix. *sub init.*, 'Optime se habet omnis filius, quum vestigia perfecti patris . . . imitatur. Humanum genus filius est coeli . . . *generat enim homo hominem et sol*, iuxta secundum de Naturali auditu' (i.e. Aristotle, Phys. *l.c.*). Again Aristotle (Met. λ. 5. 1071 a. 13) says, 'ἀνθρώπου αἴτιον τά τε στοιχεῖα πῦρ καὶ γῆ, κ.τ.λ. . . . καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα ὁ ἥλιος.' Compare also Par. xxii. 116, where the sun is described as 'Quegli ch' è padre d' ogni mortal vita.'

I shall now group together a number of passages, the interest of which depends upon the use that may be made of the quotation for the purposes of textual criticism. This is obviously a process requiring very great judgement and caution, as has been already pointed out, *sup.* pp. 35 to 41, where some of the more obvious and necessary precautions have been indicated. However, each case must be judged as it arises on its own merits and in view of its special circumstances. It need hardly be said that it is in reference to the text of the Convito that such questions chiefly arise. This is partly due to the intrinsic difficulty of many of the subjects discussed, and partly to the absence of metre, which is obviously a great safeguard against conjectural liberties being taken with the text. I will discuss these passages in the order in which they occur in that treatise.

(54)

Conv. I. vii. 1. 58. E l' uomo è obbediente alla giustizia [quando] comanda al peccatore.

Compare Aristotle, Nic. Eth. V. i. § 12 (1129 b. 11–14), ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ παράνομος ἄδικος ἦν, ὁ δὲ νόμιμος δίκαιος, δῆλον ὅτι πάντα τὰ νόμιμά ἐστί πως δίκαια· τά τε γὰρ ὡρισμένα ὑπὸ τῆς νομοθετικῆς νόμιμά ἐστι, καὶ ἕκαστον τούτων δίκαιον εἶναι φαμέν.

I have put these passages in comparison with some hesitation, as there is certainly no quotation, and it may be doubted whether there is even any conscious reminiscence of the passage, nor again does the language of Aristotle exactly

help us to determine the reading in this extremely difficult and corrupt passage in the Convito. But it seems to me that it may serve to justify and illustrate the sense which would be given by one version of the passage, and that the one which perhaps involves the smallest departure from the MS. authorities. It shows that the sentiment is an Aristotelian one, so that it is not unlikely to be formulated by Dante. Dante appeals to the distinction (as one apparently already recognized) between universal and particular nature[1], and explains how the latter is obedient to the former in the details of the organization of man or other animals. And in the same way he says (i. e. if we adopt the partly conjectural reading given above) man is obedient to justice when he commands, or imposes laws or restrictions upon offenders. In this way man or human society in the enactments of law stands in the same relation to the principles of justice, as particular nature does to universal nature in carrying out the details of animal organization. If this be the meaning of this very obscure and doubtful passage, the sentiment is little more than an echo of that of Aristotle *l. c.*, viz. that τὰ νόμιμα are merely the embodiment of the principles of justice, so that ὁ παράνομος (comp. '*peccatore*') is also ἄδικος.

The *lect. vulg.*, as supplied by the MSS., is generally this: 'e l'uomo obbediente alla giustizia comanda al peccatore.' My MS., however, has 'e l'uomo è obbediente alla giustizia al peccatore,' where it is obvious that some words must have dropped out between '*giustizia*' and '*al peccatore.*' This MS., however, supplies us with *è* before *obbediente*, which others seem generally to have lost in the concourse of three vowels; and this I have accordingly adopted in the text. It seems to follow from a comparison with the previous sentence, to which this is parallel, that a clause with *quando* is required, and the supply of this single word before *comanda* (which is given us by the other MSS.) seems to provide at least a possible and tolerable sense to the passage with the *minimum* of conjectural change. If so, we may, I think, appeal to the language of

[1] This is itself a curious and difficult point. As to the origin and meaning of the distinction see further *infra*, pp. 155, 156.

Aristotle, in a context with which Dante was familiar, to support the sentiment which is thus attributed to him.

(55)

Conv. II. iii. ll. 61 seqq. Aristotile . . . dice nel secondo *di Cielo e Mondo*, la Luna, essendo mezza (*vulg.* nuova), entrare sotto a Marte dalla parte non lucente, e Marte stare celato tanto che rapparve dall' altra lucente della Luna.

This quotation from Aristotle enables us, as it seems to me, with almost certainty to correct the received text. Dante is quoting Aristotle, *de Coelo*, II. xii. (292 a. 4), for his description of an occultation of Mars by the moon, and how he saw the planet disappear on the dark limb and reappear on the light limb. Aristotle describes the moon (naturally) as διχότομον οὖσαν. The *lect. vulg.* in the Convito—and that, moreover, which is stated to occur in all the MSS.[1]—is 'la Luna essendo *nuova*.' This is not only absurd in itself, as the new moon is invisible, but has no relation to Aristotle's διχότομον, or, as the Antiqua Translatio has it, 'dicothomam existentem.' There seems, therefore, to be no doubt that Witte is right in substituting *mezza* for *nuova*. Besides this, there are two other blunders still more absurd, viz. the double insertion of *non* in the MSS., thus, 'e Marte *non* stare celato tanto che rapparve dall' altra *non* lucente della Luna.' The original of the quotation, as well as common sense, shows that both these negatives should be omitted.

(56)

Conv. III. ii. ll. 124 seqq. . . . Siccome dice il Filosofo massimamente nel terzo (*vulg.* sesto) *dell' Anima*, dove dice che in essa è una virtù che si chiama *scientifica*, e una che si chiama *ragionativa* ovvero *consigliativa*: e con questa sono certe virtù, ... siccome la virtù *inventiva* [*imaginativa*?] e *giudicativa*.

This reference is a very difficult one to identify. It is apparently not intended to be very definite, as Dante's words are 'siccome dice il Filosofo *massimamente* nel terzo[2] *dell'*

[1] Auct. Monti, *Saggio*, &c., p. 23.

[2] It has already been observed (*sup.* p. 37) that all the MSS. here are said to read *sesto*. But this is not only an error, since there are only three books, but it is an error which Dante (thoroughly well-acquainted as he was with the

Anima.' No doubt up and down de Anima, Bk. III, most, if not all, the powers (*virtù*) of the soul here mentioned are spoken of, but nowhere, I think, do they occur in such formal union or contrast as is here implied. But as regards the first group mentioned by Dante, *scientifica* (ἐπιστημονικόν) and *ragionativa* (λογιστικόν) ovvero *consigliativa* (βουλευτικόν), they are precisely thus united in Nic. Eth. VI. i. § 6 (1139 a. 12), where Aristotle expressly says, τὸ γὰρ βουλεύεσθαι καὶ λογίζεσθαι ταὐτόν. In the Translatio Antiqua, which Dante would use, the words used are *scientificum*, *ratiocinativum*, and, a few lines below, *consiliativum*: the actual words here being 'et consiliari enim et ratiocinari idem.'

When we proceed to the next group, the MSS. read *inventiva* and *giudicativa*. There seems to be no passage anywhere in Aristotle from which *inventiva* (εὑρετικόν?) could be derived. But in De Anim. III we have a great deal about φαντασία and τὸ φανταστικόν in several chapters. Also in c. ix *init.* we have τὸ κριτικόν (*giudicativa*) set down as one of the two chief δυνάμεις of the soul, and in § 3 of the same chapter τὸ φανταστικόν occupies a prominent position in the discussion. On these grounds, I think, we should perhaps be justified in reading *imaginativa* for *inventiva* in this passage, as I find was once suggested by Dr. Witte (Giorn. Arcad., 1825), though without any reasons given.

(57)

Conv. III. iii. ll. 81–83.

In this passage (which is quoted *infra*), Dr. Witte, in his *Nuova Centuria di Correzioni*, has proposed, as it seems to me, a most unfortunate alteration of the text, apparently without any MS. support for his conjecture, on the grounds of a supposed resemblance to 1 John ii. 16 ('lust of the flesh, and lust of the eyes'). Dante is describing a 'natura quarta' in man, '*degli animali*, cioè sensitiva,' and a corresponding 'amore' which 'ama secondo la sensibile apparenza, *siccome*

De Anima) could not himself have made. It was therefore doubtless due to a copyist. Further (*a*) VI might be easily confused with III, much more so than with I or II: and (*b*) B III is the one containing passages most nearly corresponding with the statement made by Dante.

bestia;' and he speaks of its 'soperchievole operazione nel diletto massimamente del *gusto e del tatto*.' Witte proposes to alter *gusto* into *vista*. But surely Nic. Eth. III. x. 8 (1118 a. 23–25) has suggested Dante's language here, and that shows *gusto* to be the correct reading. The Antiqua Translatio runs thus: 'Circa tales utique temperantia et intemperantia est *quibus reliqua animalia communicant*, unde serviles et *bestiales* videntur. Hoc autem sunt *tactus et gustus*.' Observe that Dante is speaking of the 'natura quarta *degli animali*,' and note also the occurrence of *siccome bestia* in the passage (as above quoted).

(58)

Conv. III. viii. ll. 175 seqq. Le [passioni] connaturali . . . tutto che molto per buona consuetudine si facciano lievi, del tutto non se ne vanno quanto al primo movimento. Ma vannosene bene del tutto, quanto a durazione, perocchè la consuetudine †non† è equabile alla natura, nella quale è il principio di quelle.

Comp. Nic. Eth. VII. x. 4 (1152 a. 31), διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἔθος χαλεπόν (*scil.* μετακινῆσαι), ὅτι τῇ φύσει ἔοικεν; and Rhet. I. xi. 3 (1370 a. 6, 7), καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἐθισμένον ὥσπερ πεφυκὸς ἤδη γίγνεται· ὅμοιον γάρ τι τὸ ἔθος τῇ φύσει.

This seems to be one of the few extreme cases in which one would be disposed to omit conjecturally (though not without leaving the word obelized that readers may be free to exercise their own judgement) a 'non' found in all the MSS. hitherto examined. This strong step seems to be almost required by the context, and also to be supported by the above passages from Aristotle, which were no doubt familiar to Dante. The argument of the context is this:—Some passions are a matter of bad habit, others have their root in natural constitution (a distinction similar to, though not quite identical with, that of Aristotle in Eth. III. xi. 1). The former can be entirely cured by cultivating the contrary habit (ll. 171–175). The latter can be weakened by habit, but not wholly eradicated in respect of their first motions (l. 179), though they can be so as to their continuance[1], because

[1] This in fact explains how we may be 'tempted, yet without sin,' when the

custom or habit is equivalent to nature in which their germs subsist. This word 'because' (perocchè) seems to require the omission of *non*, since it introduces the explanation of the possibility of a complete conquest of natural passions, *quant' a durazione*, by means of habit. This possibility is due to habit or custom becoming equivalent (*equabile* or ὅμοιον) to nature, a *dictum* familiar to readers of Aristotle. The only alternative that I can see would be to remove the stop at *movimento* and place the words from *quanto al primo* to *durazione* in a parenthesis, so as to make the words 'perocchè la consuetudine *non* è, &c.' explanatory of the more distant paragraph 'del tutto non se ne vanno.' But I should prefer the other method of dealing with the difficulty, partly because of the familiarity of this aphorism of Aristotle and others (e.g. Evenus quoted in the same context of the Ethics), and partly because I can suppose an inconsiderate copyist inserting the *non* without due regard to the context, and from a plausible notion that habit or custom is, speaking generally, weaker than nature. This also is true in a sense, as indeed is recognized by Aristotle in the same place in the Ethics, where he says, 'ῥᾷον γὰρ ἔθος μετακινῆσαι φύσεως.' Hence we are not venturing to propose a change of text without at any rate being able to trace a natural genesis for the corruption which is supposed to have occurred.

(59)

Conv. III. ix. ll. 59–63. . . . Siccom' è la *figura*, la *grandezza*, il *numero*, lo *movimento* e lo *star fermo*; che *sensibili* [*comuni*] si chiamano, le quali cose con più sensi comprendiamo.

De An. II. vi. (418 a. 17–19), τὰ μὲν οὖν τοιαῦτα λέγεται ἰδια ἑκάστου, κοινὰ δέ, κίνησις, ἠρεμία, ἀριθμός, σχῆμα, μέγεθος· τὰ μὲν γὰρ τοιαῦτα οὐδεμιᾶς ἐστὶν ἴδια, ἀλλὰ κοινὰ πάσαις.

This passage in the Convito is little more than a transcript of that cited from the De Anima, the context of which has been definitely quoted by Dante a few lines earlier. We can therefore, I think, safely replace the word *comuni* which has

primo movimento, resulting from the possession of a body 'with its affections and lusts,' is not allowed to acquire *durazione*.

somehow dropped out of the MSS. It is not only required by the sense, but it is, so to speak, the *key-word* of the whole passage in Aristotle, and could not possibly have been left out by any one quoting it with such full knowledge of its language and context as Dante here displays. Moreover it is necessary to justify the words which follow, which quite correctly define what Aristotle meant by the technical expression '*sensibili comuni*.'

(60)

Conv. III. xi. l. 8. (Quoted *infra.*)

This is a good instance of a quotation enabling us to correct a false reading, though it is found in most editions, and appears also in most, if not all, MSS.; since those who have seen the necessity for the correction have argued it on considerations of sense, without appealing to the authority of MSS. for the alteration. The editions to which I have access (except Giuliani, who corrects *e conj.*) all read—'conoscere la cosa sia sapere quello ch' ella è . . . per tutte le sue *cose*, siccome dice il Filosofo nel principio della *Fisica*.' The passage is found in Phys. I. i. *sub init.*, τότε γὰρ οἰόμεθα γινώσκειν ἕκαστον ὅταν τὰ αἴτια γνωρίσωμεν τὰ πρῶτα, κ.τ.λ., or as it would be in Dante's version—'*causas* primas.' There can, therefore, be no reasonable doubt that Dante wrote *cause*, which being an archaic form was mistaken by copyists for *cose*, and hence the *lect. vulg.* It should be noted that Giuliani, working (as often) solely by conjecture, substitutes *cagioni*, which of course would not account for the *lect. fals.* We have no hesitation, therefore, in replacing *cause*, which not only conforms the passage to the quotation, but obviously accounts for the error which has displaced the word. I do not find that even Dr. Witte has made this correction.

(61)

Ib. l. 12. Siccome si dice nel quarto della *Metafisica.*

In commenting upon this quotation, Mazzuchelli declares that no such passage can be found in Bk. IV, but that more than one can be quoted from Bk. VI. They do not seem specially appropriate however, whereas in Bk. IV (*al.* III. but

IV according to the arrangement of the Antiqua Translatio) c. vii. *sub fin.* (1012 a. 23, 4) we find apparently the actual words quoted by Dante, viz. *ὁ γὰρ λόγος, οὗ τὸ ὄνομα σημεῖον, ὁρισμὸς γίγνεται*, or according to the Antiqua Translatio, 'Ratio namque, cuius nomen est signum, diffinitio est rei'—words that seem, though the order is inverted, to be closely enough represented by those of Dante, 'la definizione è quella ragione che 'l nome significa.' Giuliani has characteristically substituted *sesto* for *quarto* in the text, a substitution which, even if correct in fact, would be quite unjustifiable in an editor without MS. authority, since Dante's memory was not infallible, any more than that of the 'Maestro di color che sanno' on one or two occasions. In this case, however, Dante seems to have been quite right.

(62)

Conv. III. xi. ll. 139-144. E siccome fine dell' amistà vera è la *buona dilezione*, che procede dal convivere [*al.* convenire] secondo l' umanità propriamente, cioè secondo ragione, siccome pare sentire Aristotile nel nono dell' *Etica*.

Compare with this Nic. Eth. IX. ix. § 10 (1170 b. 8): *τὸ δ' εἶναι ἦν αἱρετὸν διὰ τὸ αἰσθάνεσθαι αὐτοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ὄντος, ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη αἴσθησις ἡδεῖα καθ' ἑαυτήν. συναισθάνεσθαι ἄρα δεῖ καὶ τοῦ φίλου ὅτι ἔστιν, τοῦτο δὲ γίνοιτ' ἂν ἐν τῷ συζῆν καὶ κοινωνεῖν λόγων καὶ διανοίας· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν δόξειε τὸ συζῆν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων λέγεσθαι, καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν βοσκημάτων τὸ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νέμεσθαι, κ.τ.λ.*

The above passage of the Convito involves a general reference rather than an exact quotation. There are other places in Ethics, Bk. IX, which might be cited in support or illustration of the sentiments attributed here by Dante to Aristotle. This passage which I have quoted, however, seems to have been distinctly in Dante's mind, since it throws light on the words 'convivere secondo l' umanità propriamente, cioè secondo ragione,' the equivalent of which it contains. And, this being so, it appears to me to support strongly the reading *convivere*, which is the reading, as far as I know, of one MS. only, the Cod. Ricc. (the readings of which are often very good), as

against *convenire*, which is defended by Giuliani, and adopted in all the editions which I have seen, except that of Fraticelli. Besides, *συζῆν* is so prominent an idea, not only in the above passage, but in several other places in Ethics, Bk. IX, e.g. ch. xii. §§ 2, 3, that I have no doubt we should read *convivere* here. The same variants *convivere* and *convenire* occur again at IV. xvii. l. 54, and again, and on similar grounds, I think *convivere* is to be preferred there also.

(63)

Conv. IV. vii. ll. 110–115. Siccome dice Aristotile, nel secondo *dell' Anima*, vivere è l' essere delli viventi; e perciocchè *vivere* è per molti modi (siccome nelle piante *vegetare*, negli animali *vegetare* e *sentire*, negli uomini *vegetare*, *sentire*, *muovere* e *ragionare*), &c.

The passage referred to by Aristotle is in De An. II. ii. (413 a. 22–b. 14), but it is too long to quote here. It fully confirms the reading as given above, which is that (with only one recorded exception) of all the MSS. But the editors noticing the attribution of *muovere* to man, and not to animals as such, thought they had detected an error, and proceeded *more suo* to correct it. The Edd. Mil. (followed by Fraticelli) inserted *muovere* after the first *sentire*; Giuliani omitted it altogether. Both, I think, were wrong, and the MS. reading is certainly to be maintained. If they had referred to the passage in Aristotle expressly cited by Dante, they would have found that Aristotle distinctly denies 'muovere' to be a necessary attribute of *animal* life as such. See 413 b. 3: '*τὸ δὲ ζῶον διὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν πρώτως· καὶ γὰρ τὰ μὴ κινούμενα μηδ' ἀλλάττοντα τόπον, ἔχοντα δὲ αἴσθησιν ζῷα λέγομεν καὶ οὐ ζῆν μόνον.*' Compare also later on, *ib.* II. iii. (415 a. 6): *τῶν αἰσθητικῶν δὲ τὰ μὲν ἔχει τὸ κατὰ τόπον κινητικόν, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει.*

(64)

Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 30 seqq. *Fortezza*, la quale è arme e freno a moderare l'audacia e la timidità nostra nelle cose che sono corruzione (*lect. vulg.* correzione) della nostra vita.

The disputed reading here seems to be determined by an Aristotelian reference. Dante is professedly quoting for his

definitions of this and the other Moral Virtues, 'la divina sentenza d' Aristotile' (l. 24). There seems no doubt, therefore, that we should read *corruzione*, since the words appear clearly to refer to Ethics, III. xii. 2 (1119 a. 23), where Aristotle, comparing the degree of compulsion in Cowardice and Intemperance, says of the former, ἡ μὲν λύπη ἐξίστησι καὶ φθείρει τὴν τοῦ ἔχοντος φύσιν ['*corrumpit naturam habentis*,' Ant. Transl.]. My MS. of the Convito reads *che sono di correctione*, &c. Note that conversely in IV. xxii. l. 122, all MSS. apparently have *corruzione* when the reading should clearly be *correzione*.

(65)

Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 110 seqq. Che se volemo ben mirare al processo d' Aristotile nel quarto dell' *Etica*, e a quello di Tullio in quello *degli Officii*, la *Larghezza* vuole essere a luogo e tempo, tale che il Largo non noccia a sè, nè ad altrui.

Here we have a combined quotation from Aristotle and Cicero on the subject of 'Larghezza' or Liberality. The latter part of the quotation comes so directly from Cicero, de Officiis, I. c. xiv. § 42, that it calls for no special remark. The first words, 'La Larghezza vuole essere a luogo e tempo,' very fairly paraphrase Aristotle, Nic. Eth. IV. i. 12 (1120 a. 24): 'ὁ ἐλευθέριος οὖν δώσει . . . οἷς δεῖ καὶ ὅσα καὶ ὅτε, καὶ τἆλλα ὅσα ἕπεται τῇ ὀρθῇ δόσει, though there is no actual word answering exactly to 'luogo.' Still the correspondence of sense is sufficiently obvious to enable us to correct (as most modern editors have done) the meaningless *lect. vulg.* of the MSS., 'vuole essere *lungo* tempo,' as above.

(66)

Epist. x. § 2, l. 50. Nam intellectu ac ratione *vigentes*, &c.

In this passage the corrupt reading 'intellectu et ratione *degentes*' has been reasonably corrected into *vigentes* by Giuliani, chiefly on the strength of a probable recollection of Aristotle, Pol. I. ii. 2 (1252 a. 31), 'intellectu *vigentes* aliis naturaliter principari' (Ant. Transl.), a passage directly quoted in De Mon. I. iii. l. 91, and therefore familiar to Dante.

(67)

Epist. x. § 26, l. 504. Si homo est, est *risibilis*.

Here we have two readings, 'si homo est, est *risibilis*,' and 'est *visibilis*,' both of which are found in different MSS. and editions. There can be little doubt in any case as to the correctness of the former, since it was a common observation that laughter was peculiar to man among the animals. Dante may perhaps have derived this directly from Aristotle, de Part. Anim. III. x. (673 a. 8), '*τὸ μόνον γελᾷν τῶν ζώων ἄνθρωπον*.'

(68)

Purg. xxii. 106, 107. Euripide v' è nosco, ed Antifonte,
Simonide, Agatone ed altri piùe, &c.

Here there are variants *Antifonte* and *Anacreonte*. The former appears to have overwhelming MS. authority, but yet the latter is a very old variant, since it is found it the Ottimo Comento (1333–4). It has also been adopted in a great many editions. But in any case it would be appropriate to ask, remembering that Dante would not be acquainted with these or the other Greek authors mentioned at first hand, with which is he more likely to have been in some way familiar from quotations in authors known and studied by him? Now Antiphon, Simonides, and Agathon are all of them frequently quoted by Aristotle, e.g. in the Rhetoric alone (with which Dante was well acquainted) Antiphon is named three times, Agathon twice, and Simonides seven times. They are all three mentioned also by Aristotle elsewhere, whereas Anacreon is never, I believe, referred to by Aristotle. I do not, of course, mean to imply that Dante could not have been acquainted with Antiphon or Anacreon in any other way, but quotation by Aristotle is certainly the most likely and obvious source for his knowledge in such cases. Thus the argument may fairly be used as supporting the reading *Antifonte*, and at any rate as a complete answer to the objection which has been made that he is a much less known poet than Anacreon. He may be so to us. The question is, which name is more likely to have been known to Dante?

A few passages remain where some doubt or difficulty attaches to the citation.

(69)

Conv. II. ix. l. 78. Aristotile l' afferma, quando dice nel duodecimo *degli Animali*, che l' uomo è perfettissimo di tutti gli animali.

The reference seems to be to the de Hist. Anim. Bk. VIII, c. i. (588 a. 20 *seqq.*). The drift of this interesting passage is to assert the continuity (*μετάβασις συνεχής*) in nature from inanimate objects to vegetable life, thence to animal life (the 'fungo marino' being a connecting link, 588 b. 12, see *supra*, p. 137), and thence to man, who thus becomes 'the head and crown of things.' But man himself, in the earlier stages of his development, not only embryonic, but even those of childhood, differs little, if at all, from the lower animals, *διαφέρει δ' οὐθὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς τῶν θηρίων ψυχῆς κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον* (*scil.* *τὴν τῶν παίδων ἡλικίαν*). But as the treatise de Hist. Anim. contains only ten books, Mazzuchelli (*h. l.*) suggests that perhaps in Dante's time the four books de Partibus Animalium may have preceded the ten books of de Historia Animalium, thus forming one collection 'de Animalibus,' of which consequently Bk. VIII. of the latter treatise would form Bk. XII. It is to be observed that Dante merely quotes from the twelfth Book, *degli Animali*, which leaves the ground open for such an explanation. Further, we know that in Michael Scot's translation from Arabic into Latin, the Historiae Animalium consisted of nineteen books, comprising besides the ten of the present Historia Animalium, the de Gen. Anim. (five books), and the de Part. Anim. (four books). See Jourdain, Traductions Latines d'Aristote, pp. 172, 327. Jourdain also mentions a quotation from an Arabian writer of the eleventh Book of 'the Animals' of Aristotle, which comes from the first Book of the de Part. Anim., so that he at any rate combined the two treatises into one, though in a different order from that which seems to be implied by the citation in Dante.

(70)

We next compare

Conv. II. xv. ll. 40–43. E questi tre movimenti soli (*viz.* (1) locale, (2) dell' alterazione, (3) del crescere) mostra la Fisica; siccome nel quinto del primo suo libro è provato.

with Aristotle, Phys. V. i. (*fin.*) (225 b. 7), *ἀνάγκη τρεῖς εἶναι κινήσεις, τήν τε τοῦ ποίου καὶ τὴν τοῦ πόσου καὶ τὴν κατὰ τόπον.*

The reference for this quotation in Dante is given in a curious and unusual form. The name of the author quoted does not appear. The subject of 'Physics' is in a manner personified, and a reference is made to the fifth (chapter?) of 'her first Book.' Such an expression could hardly, in the mouth of Dante, refer to any other treatise than that of Aristotle. Otherwise we should certainly expect the quotation, being in such an unusual form, to be from some other work; and so, of course, it may possibly still be, especially as in Aristotle, Phys. I. v., there is nothing to correspond to this. In V. i. however, there is a passage (quoted above) which exactly expresses the statements made by Dante, except that the order of the three kinds of Motion is altered. It is probable that the rectification of the reference by the reversal of the numbers is purely accidental, for I do not believe that the division into chapters was recognized in Dante's time. At least I have been unable to trace it[1].

(71)

Conv. IV. xi. l. 83. Disse Aristotile che 'quanto più l'uomo soggiace allo intelletto, tanto meno soggiace alla fortuna.'

This appears to be an 'apocryphal' quotation. I am indebted to the learned notes of Mazzuchelli for the probable explanation of it; and it is one which may apply to some other doubtful quotations, and indeed possibly to some

[1] There is a case in Conv. III. xiv. l. 98, where a reference is made by Dante to '*secondo* della Metafisica,' the true reference being to Bk. I. ch. ii. This again is probably accidental, and the error is due to a slip of memory. All the MSS. examined are reported as having *secondo*. We have no right, therefore, to replace it by *primo*, as is done by Giuliani, Fraticelli, and other editors, without further evidence that the error was not likely to have been made by Dante himself (see *supra*, p. 37).

genuine and accurate ones also. I mean that it is a quotation at secondhand, and made without verification. Mazzuchelli observes that in the Novissima Polyanthea Josephi Langii, the following sentiment is attributed, *s. v.* 'Fortuna,' to Aristotle, Lib. de Bona Fortuna, 'Ubi plurimus intellectus et ratio, ibi minima fortuna.' Such collections of quotations, 'Adagia,' 'Florilegia,' &c., were numerous from early times, as we have already seen, and were successively copied and enlarged[1]. It is observable that Dante does not profess, as he usually does, to give a reference to any definite work of Aristotle[2]. Again, in Conv. IV. xii. l. 120, a sentiment attributed to Seneca seems to be capable of a similar explanation. See also *s. v.* Horace, *infra*.

(72)

Par. xiii. 76–78. Ma la natura la dà sempre scema,
Similemente operando all' artista,
Ch' ha l' abito dell' arte, e man che trema.

It seems not improbable that this beautiful comparison of nature to an artist with an unsteady hand, so that he cannot always 'do the things that he would,' may have been suggested by Aristotle, Phys. II. viii. (199 a. 33), *ἁμαρτία δὲ γίγνεται καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τεχνήν· ἔγραψε γὰρ οὐκ ὀρθῶς ὁ γραμματικός, καὶ ἐπότισεν οὐκ ὀρθῶς ὁ ἰατρὸς τὸ φάρμακον· ὥστε δῆλον ὅτι ἐνδέχεται καὶ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ φύσιν.* But if this or other similar passages in Aristotle may have suggested the comparison, it is most interesting to observe the transformation which the idea has undergone by a touch of the poet's hand. An admirable didactic illustration has become an exquisite piece of poetry. (See *supra*, pp. 23 *seqq.* for other instances of this.)

Note on Universal and Particular Nature.

I will here draw attention to an interesting series of passages in which Dante refers to a distinction between the operations of 'Natura universalis' and 'Natura particularis.' The distinction has a sort of Aristotelian flavour about it, but, as far as I can ascertain, it is not to be found in Aristotle. Dante does

[1] It is hardly necessary to observe that this particular collection was long after Dante's time, but was no doubt founded on earlier ones. See *sup.* pp. 15 16.

[2] See a similar case under Cicero, No. 23.

not indeed profess to be making any quotation, but yet his language seems to me to imply that he is appealing to a doctrine already familiar, and not originating a new theory, especially as the distinction occurs so often in his works. The following are the passages in question, with their contents briefly summarized :— (1) Conv. I. vii. ll. 54 *seqq*. Particular Nature obeys Universal Nature when she gives man thirty-two teeth, or five fingers on each hand. (The application made of this is very difficult to explain, the passage following being apparently corrupt.) (2) In Conv. III. iv. ll. 98 *seqq*., Universal Nature is identified with God, as the author of the limits of the human intellect or intelligence. (3) In Conv. IV. ix. ll. 15-33, the operations of Universal Nature are said to be co-extensive with the Universe, but the Universe, i. e. Heaven and Earth, is declared (on the authority of Aristotle) to be, however vast, not infinite or without limit. Thus Universal Nature, and by consequence Particular Nature, has limits, and those limits are imposed by Him who is Himself without limit, viz. God. Thus in this passage a distinction is drawn between Universal Nature and God. (4) Once more, in Conv. IV. xxvi. ll. 18–20, Universal Nature is said to order Particular Nature to its perfection. This statement resembles the passage which was first quoted. Lastly, it is interesting to find the distinction occurring three times in the disputed Quaestio de Aqua et Terra, §§ 18 *bis* and 20. This appears to me to be one of several similar indications in the way of favourable internal evidence, which have not received sufficient attention from those who have peremptorily rejected this treatise. (5) In the first passage, § 18, ll. 20 *seqq*., it is declared that Universal Nature can never fail to attain its end, but that Particular Nature may do so, owing to the stubbornness (*inobedientiam*) of the subject-matter on which it has to work. (6) In the next passage, l. 55 of the same section, all nature is said to be obedient to the purpose of Universal Nature, and so the sometimes adverse tendencies of what is described as the ' simplex natura ' of an object may be overcome. Thus the ' simplex natura ' of earth is to fall downwards, but ' necesse est . . . inesse aliam naturam[1] per quam obediret intentioni universalis naturae ; ' and this is explained to mean that it is able to rise, or to elevate itself, in response to the attraction of the heavens. Even so in man the appetitive part, which tends to follow the promptings of sense, can be diverted ' a proprio impetu[2] ' so as to obey Reason. (7) The passage in the next section merely recalls and repeats the sentiment of that last explained.

As far as I can make out, the distinction insisted on in all these passages was probably suggested to Dante by Albertus Magnus. That at any rate is in itself a not unlikely source, and I have not so far been able to find any other. In his Physica, Lib. II. Tract i. Chapter V is headed ' digressio declarans quod est esse secundum cursum naturae universalis, et secundum cursum naturae particularis.' First, several senses of the term Universal Nature are distinguished, and then occur such passages as the following, which may be compared with those above noticed in Dante. ' Dicitur natura universalis quae universaliter continet et regit omnem naturam particularem[3].' Again the following passage resembles the second of those from the Quaestio, ' . . . aliquid est cuius principium movendo

[1] We are reminded here of the Aristotelian expression ἔοικε δὲ καὶ ἄλλη τις φύσις τῆς ψυχῆς ἄλογος εἶναι. Nic. Eth. I. xiii. 15 (1102 b. 13).

[2] This recalls the language, though the application is different, of Par. i, ll. 130–135.

[3] Ed. Lugduni, 1651. Vol. ii. p. 61 a, ll. 11. Compare p 61 b, ll. 11, 12.

non est particularis natura, sed est extra cursum suum naturalem: cuius tamen principium et causa est natura universalis et secundum suum cursum naturalem.' (P. 61 b. ll. 22 *seqq.*) Then follows a very curious illustration of the difference between Universal and Particular Nature, and of a product which is according to the 'natural course' of Universal, but not of Particular Nature. The production of woman was never the purpose of Particular Nature, 'sed causatur ex corruptione alicuius principiorum naturalium, eo quod natura intendit opus perfectum, quod est mas;' and in support of this Aristotle is referred to [1] . . . 'tamen foemina non est extra cursum universalis naturae, quae ordinis est causa in inferioribus, . . . quoniam nisi esset necessaria generationi, nunquam natura duceret foeminam.' Again, another illustration is drawn from Death, which is 'praeter cursum particularis naturae,' but is brought about by Universal Nature, which imposes a limit to the duration of the existence of corruptible things. The general idea of the existence of such a distinction, rather than the particular details of it, seem to be reproduced by Dante. It may be noticed that Albertus refutes a doctrine on this subject attributed to Plato and Hermes Trismegistus because (among other grounds) it involves a relation between Universal and Particular Nature, which would be inconsistent with the views of Aristotle. This at any rate seems to imply that the doctrine was thought to be an Aristotelian one.

PLATO.

DANTE'S knowledge of the actual works of Plato was doubtless limited (as was that of other writers nearly, if not quite, up to his time) to the Timaeus, though from passages in Aristotle, Cicero, and perhaps St. Augustine, he was aware of some of his doctrines beyond the limits of that work. The Timaeus of Plato was translated into Latin and commented on by Chalcidius (probably end of fifth century, *al.* end of the fourth), many centuries before a similar service was undertaken for Aristotle [2], or indeed for any other works of Plato. Consequently for many centuries, and until the end of the twelfth century at least, if not later, all knowledge of Plato seems to have been limited to this one treatise, and derived entirely from the work of Chalcidius. This applies (*auct.*

[1] Apparently De Gen. Anim. II. iii. (737, a. 28) in the passage intended—'τὸ θῆλυ ὥσπερ ἄρρεν ἐστὶ πεπηρωμένον.'

[2] Except a fragment of the *Organon* attributed to Boethius (*c.* 500). See Rashdall's *Universities of Europe*, &c., i. p. 37. Also the *Phaedo* and *Meno* appear to have been translated (*c.* 1160), but were not generally known (*ib.*).

Hauréau) even to such a writer as Dun Scotus, who though he could read Greek, does not appear to have had any further knowledge of Plato than his contemporaries who had not that advantage. In the twelfth century the work of Chalcidius was widely known, and a commentary was written upon it [1]. Ozanam suggests that Dante may have had access to a commentary on the Timaeus written by St. Thomas Aquinas, but now unhappily lost [2].

It will be convenient to group the references to Plato according to the subjects treated of.

(1)

The relation of the soul to the stars.

There are three places in which Dante refers to Plato's theories on this subject, viz. :—

(1) **Par. iv. 22.** Ancor di dubitar ti dà cagione,
Parer tornarsi l' anime alle stelle,
Secondo la sentenza di Platone.

Then ll. 49–60 explain more at length, 'quel che Timeo dell' anime argomenta.'

(2) **Conv. IV. xxi. l. 17.** Plato e altri vollero che esse (*sc.* nostre anime) procedessero dalle stelle, e fossero nobili e più e meno, secondo la nobiltà della stella.

(3) **Conv. II. xiv. ll. 28 seqq.** Quanto alla prima perfezione, cioè della generazione sustanziale, tutti li filosofi concordano che i cieli sono cagione; avvegnachè diversamente questo pongano: quali dalli motori, siccome Plato, Avicenna e Algazel; quali da esse stelle (spezialmente l' anime umane), siccome Socrate, e anche Plato, e Dionisio Accademico.'

These references are all obviously derived from Timaeus, 41 D and E and 42 B. The passages appear as follows in Chalcidius: 'delegit animas stellarum numero pares, singulasque singulis comparavit, easdemque vehiculis competentibus superimpositas universae rei naturam spectare iussit, legesque

[1] These statements are made on the authority of Wrobel, the latest editor of this work of Chalcidius, Leipzig, 1876.

[2] Dante et la Philosophie Catholique, p. 197.

immutabilis decreti docuit ostendens, quod prima quidem generatio uniformis in omnibus eiusdemque ordinis esset futura, ne cui competens iustum aliqua ex parte a se minueretur. Oportebat porro satas eas certis legitimisque temporum vicibus piae nationis animalium [1], quaeque praeter ceteras animantes deum suspiciant, afferre frugem . . .' [Then, after a brief description of the conflict with violent passions, &c., he continues,] 'Et victricibus quidem ad comparis stellae contubernium sedemque reditum patere, acturis deinceps vitam veram et beatam. Victas porro mutare sexum,' &c.

This translation is extremely free and paraphrastic in places. The important word *competentibus*, near the beginning, has nothing to represent it in the original. Again, 'Oportebat porro satas esse certis legitimisque temporum vicibus,' is meant as a translation of δέοι δὲ σπαρείσας αὐτὰς εἰς τὰ προσήκοντα ἑκάσταις ἕκαστα ὄργανα χρόνου φῦναι ζῴων τὸ θεοσεβέστατον (where ὄργανα χρόνου means the 'planets'); and what follows next seems to wander away from the text altogether.

There appears to be a difference, intended by Plato, between the partition (νομή) among the fixed stars of 'soul-substance' (if we may use such a phrase), when prepared and compounded in the manner that has just been described by him, and the subsequent sowing (σπόρος) of individual human souls in the several planets (ὄργανα χρόνου) [2], according to their suitability for each (εἰς τὰ προσήκοντα ἑκάσταις ἕκαστα). We need not enter into the many difficulties that might be raised here, since we are not concerned with the interpretation of Plato, except in so far as it bears upon Dante's references to him. It may be observed, however, that in Conv. IV. xxi. l. 17, Dante gives considerable prominence to the correspondence of dignity between the souls and the stars from which they severally proceed. (See the quotation given above.)

Now, (1) except that Chalcidius inserts, as I have noted, 'competentibus,' there is even less in his translation than in

[1] Chalcidius in his Commentary says that 'piae nationis animal' hominem significat (§ cxci.).

[2] See Mr. Archer-Hind's note on 41 D.

the original to justify this definite statement of Dante as to the correspondence between the souls and stars. (2) It does not appear in Plato how the fitness implied in προσήκοντα comes about; and, what is more important, he seems to speak of the suitability of the star to some quality of the soul *already developed*, whereas, in Dante's representation, it is rather *vice versa*, the character of the soul is *derived* from that of the star.

This passage of Plato is referred to by St. Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xiii. c. 19 *med.*, but in the statement that it is the peculiar privilege of the wise and good, 'ut aliquanto diutius *in astro sibi congruo* quisque requiescat,' he represents more accurately than Dante the doctrine of Plato.

The references in Par. iv. 24 and 49 contain nothing but the simple statements that Plato held that souls proceed from the stars, and after death return to them again. This is sufficiently explained by the passage from the Timaeus above quoted. The kindly language in which Dante repudiates the view of Plato as to the return of the soul to the stars is very noticeable, as affording a rare model of a charitable regard for opinions from which one is compelled to differ:—

> E forse sua sentenza è d' altra guisa
> Che la voce non suona, ed esser puote
> Con intenzion da non esser derisa.
>
> (Par. iv. 55–57).

In Conv. II. xiv. ll. 31 *seqq.* the same passage of the Timaeus, or some reproduction of it, is evidently in Dante's mind, and here Dante attributes two opinions to Plato:—

(1) That in common with Avicenna and Algazel he held that the *prima perfezione della generazione sustanziale* was due to the heavens or more definitely to their prime movers.

(2) That the stars themselves were rather the source of this, specially in the case of human souls[1].

The *prima perfezione della generazione sustanziale* may be illustrated by Conv. I. xiii. ll. 16 *seqq.*, where man is said to have two perfections, the first, *being*, the second, *being good*.

[1] Purg. xxx. 109–111 may be thought to combine both of these views.

Also in the passage in the Timaeus, there seems to be a distinction between the γένεσις πρώτη, in which all had equal advantages, when the soul-substance was (as above explained) distributed (ἔνειμε) among the stars, and the subsequent sowing of the individual souls (σπαρείσας) into the several planets as suited to each. Some such distinction seems dimly to be reproduced in the passage by Dante, especially when we note his introduction of the words 'spezialmente l'anime umane.' At any rate this reference to Plato does not appear to go beyond the passage in the Timaeus already referred to, in whatever form it may have found its way to Dante.

(2)

The motions of the Earth.

In Conv. III. v. ll. 45 *seqq.*, Plato is stated by Dante to have taught that the earth has a revolution on its axis, but has no orbital motion in space: and this in contrast with Pythagoras, on the one hand, who assigned to it and to its 'invisible counterpart' an orbital revolution, and to Aristotle, on the other, who denied to it motion of any kind. The passage in the Timaeus stands thus in Chalcidius's translation (p. 40 B.): 'Terram vero matrem et nutricem omnium terrenorum animantium *constrictam limitibus per omnia vadentis et cuncta continentis poli* diei custodem noctisque locavit.' The Greek words corresponding to those italicised are, 'εἱλλομένην δὲ περὶ τὸν διὰ παντὸς πόλον τεταμένον,' the meaning of which has been much disputed, chiefly as to whether εἱλλομένην means 'revolving' or 'packed together,' 'massed' (see an elaborate note on the passage in Mr. Archer-Hind's Timaeus). Dante clearly understood the passage in the former sense, having probably derived his knowledge of it (as is implied in the next paragraph), not from Chalcidius (in whose words this meaning could scarcely be found), but from its citation by Aristotle in De Coelo II. xiii. (293 b. 30 *seqq.*): 'ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ κειμένην ἐπὶ τοῦ κέντρου φασὶν αὐτὴν ἵλλεσθαι περὶ τὸν διὰ παντὸς τεταμένον πόλον, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ γέγραπται.' The difficulty as to the interpretation of Plato is of old standing, since Cicero (Acad. II. xxxix. § 123)

—after explaining the view of Hicetas of Syracuse, that the swift revolution of the earth about its axis was the only motion in the universe, being one that accounted for the apparent motion of all the heavenly bodies (?), and produced the same result, 'quasi stante terra caelum moveretur'—adds cautiously, 'atque hoc etiam Platonem in Timaeo dicere quidam arbitrantur, sed paullo obscurius.'

(3)

The Platonic and Aristotelian theories of Vision.

These are contrasted in Conv. III. ix. ll. 100 *seqq.*, Dante preferring, it need hardly be said, the latter[1]. His words are: 'Veramente Plato e altri filosofi dissero che 'l nostro vedere non era perchè il visibile venisse all' occhio, ma perchè la virtù visiva andava fuori al visibile. E questa opinione è riprovata per falsa dal Filosofo in quello *di Senso e Sensato*.'

This is fully borne out by the language of the Timaeus, p. 45 C, which appears as follows in the translation of Chalcidius: 'Itaque cum diurnum iubar applicat se visus fusioni (ὅταν ᾖ . . . φῶς περὶ τὸ τῆς ὄψεως ῥεῦμα), tunc nimirum incurrentia semet invicem duo similia in unius corporis cohaerent speciem, quo concurrunt oculorum acies emicantes, quoque effluentis intimae fusionis acies contiguae imaginis occursu repercutitur.'

On this Chalcidius comments thus:—'Evidenter visum fieri dicit, quotiens intimi caloris lumen, quod inoffense per oculos fluit, aliquam visibilem materiam, quam contiguam imaginem appellat, incurrit, ibidemque iuxta materiae qualitatem formatum et coloratum sensus visusque confit ex lumine, qui contiguae imaginis occursu repercussus reditu facto ad oculorum fores, usque ad mentis secreta porrigitur' (§ ccxlviii.).

The translation by Mr. Archer-Hind expresses the meaning given by Dante more clearly than either of the above passages: 'Whenever, then, there is daylight surrounding the current of vision, then this *issues forth* as like into like, and coalescing

[1] This view has been explained and adopted by Dante in this chapter, *supra*, ll. 66, *seqq.*

with the light, is formed into one uniform substance in the direct line of vision, wherever the stream *issuing from within* (*effluentis*) strikes upon some external object that falls in its way.' It is of course possible, and even probable, that Dante gathered this opinion not directly from Plato (i. e. Chalcidius), but from the context of the passage to which he refers in Aristotle, De Sensu et Sensibili (437 b. 11 *seqq.*)[1], where, as he says, it is refuted. See also further, *ib.* 438 a. 25 *seqq.*

(4)

The doctrine of the Mean in application to Virtue.

In Conv. IV. vi. ll. 115 *seqq.* Dante seems to attribute to Plato and Socrates almost *totidem verbis* the Aristotelian doctrine of the Mean as applied to Virtue. Indeed, he proceeds in the next paragraph to say that Aristotle only affirmed and brought to perfection Moral Philosophy, the main truths of which he had reached by the Socratic and Academic method. There seems nothing in Plato to justify this, but it is possible that Dante was led to make this statement by a sort of inference from what is said by Cicero, Acad. i. 4, from which he clearly borrowed in other particulars when writing this chapter. This is pointed out later in the discussion of passages quoted from Cicero. I will only, therefore, here cite two passages which especially may have suggested the inference above mentioned: 'Platonis autem auctoritate . . . una et consentiens duobus vocabulis philosophiae forma instituta est, Academicorum et Peripateticorum: qui rebus congruentes nominibus differebant' (§ 17). And again: 'Nihil enim inter Peripateticos, et illam veterem Academiam differebat' (§ 18).

(5)

The different parts of the Soul.

Though Plato is not mentioned by name, his 'error' on this subject is refuted by Dante in the difficult passage at the beginning of Purg. iv; see ll. 5, 6:—

> E questo è contra quello error, che crede
> Che un' anima sopr' altra in noi s' accenda.

[1] Or perhaps from Albertus Magnus, see *supra*, p. 140.

This probably refers to the theory expounded in Timaeus, p. 69 C. *seqq.* God Himself created what was immortal, leaving to His offspring (the δαίμονες) the creation of that which was mortal. They received from Him ἀρχὴν ψυχῆς ἀθάνατον, and around this, having added to it various desires and passions, they constructed as its dwelling-place a mortal body. But 'σεβόμενοι μιαίνειν τὸ θεῖον, ὅ τι μὴ πᾶσα ἦν ἀνάγκη,' they placed the immortal soul apart in the head, and separated it from the mortal elements of the soul by interposing the neck between it and them, 'ἵνα εἴη χωρίς.' The mortal soul was again divided into superior and inferior parts, the θυμοειδὲς and ἐπιθυμητικόν. The former was placed in the chest to be near at hand to the immortal part, and ready to come to its support, and the latter in the stomach; and then these two again were kept apart by the midriff or diaphragm separating them, 'as the women's and men's apartments are divided in houses.' This seems to explain the language of Dante in the passage above quoted.

(6)

The Platonic theory of Ideas.

Next there are two or three passages where the theory of Ἰδέαι is referred to: viz. Conv. II. v. ll. 21–34; and IV. xv. l. 55. To these we may perhaps add Par. xiii. 97, 98. There is no direct quotation from Plato himself in any of these passages, and though the general doctrine might be gathered out of the Timaeus, and especially in the places cited in the Index, it is more probable that Dante's knowledge was derived from some other source, since this was a subject generally well known in connexion with the teaching of Plato. Among such likely sources would be Aristotle, Cicero, St. Augustine, or St. Thomas Aquinas. In particular we might cite—(1) Cicero, Orator, c. iii. 'Ut igitur in formis et figuris est aliquod perfectum et excellens cuius *ad cogitatam speciem* referuntur ea quae sub oculos ipsa cadunt; &c. Has *rerum formas* appellat *ideas* . . . Plato, easque gigni negat, et ait semper esse, &c.' Compare the words italicised here with the language of Dante in ll. 31–34 of Conv. II. v.: '. . . così

queste (*sc.* Intelligenze de' cieli) fossero generatrici dell' altre cose, ed esempli ciascuna della sua spezie; e chiamale Plato *Idee,* che tanto è a dire, quanto forme e nature universali. (2) St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, vii. c. 28: 'Dicit enim (*viz.* Varro, speaking of the Samothracian mysteries) se ibi multis indiciis collegisse in simulacris aliud significare coelum, aliud terram, aliud exempla rerum, quas Plato appellat *ideas*: coelum Iovem, terram Iunonem, ideas Minervam vult intelligi . . . Qua in re omitto dicere quod Plato illas ideas tantam vim habere dicit, ut secundum eas non coelum aliquid fecerit, sed etiam coelum factum sit. Hoc dico, istum (*sc.* Varronem) in libro selectorum deorum rationem illam trium deorum quibus cuncta quasi complexus est, perdidisse:' &c. Here we seem to have the source of the remarkable statement of Dante that the Gentiles called these universal forms gods and goddesses, and worshipped them and built temples for them, not understanding them in the philosophical manner of Plato (ll. 35 *seqq.* of the same chapter).

(7)

Finally it may be noted that the allusion to Plato in Ecl. i. 11:

Et secreta poli vix exsperata Platoni,

evidently refers to the subject-matter of the Timaeus.

HOMER.

The question of Dante's knowledge of Greek need not be discussed here [1], since it is clear that if he knew anything of Homer, it was not from the original, but from some secondary

[1] It may be interesting if I add without further comment a list of passages which I have collected bearing on Dante's knowledge (?) of Greek. Conv. I. viii, II. xv, III. xi, IV. vi, xxi, xxii; Ep. to Can Grande, §§ 7, 10, 24 (cf. Conv. ii 4). Lubin (*Studi,* p. 88) mentions a curious unedited MS. in the Laurentian Library at Florence, entitled *Teleutologia,* the author of which states that he was a pupil of Dante, and that he learnt Greek from him. There is a sonnet printed among the *Rime Apocrife* by Fraticelli, p. 282, in which Dante is represented as informing Busone Novello of the progress of his son's studies, and how 'S' avaccia nello stil greco e francesco'!

source, such as his quotation by other authors, e.g. by Aristotle or Horace (see *infra*). So far as references to the story of the Iliad are concerned, such information was common in the middle ages through the prose works ascribed to Dictys and Dares. There was also a Latin work in verse known as that of 'Homerus minor,' who is mentioned in the *Registrum multorum Auctorum* of Hugo von Trimberg[1], in connexion with Statius. His words are (ll. 154, 155):

> Sequitur in ordine Statium Homerus
> Qui nunc usitatus est, sed non ille verus:

and he apologizes for introducing him here by explaining that the true Homer wrote in Greek, and had not been translated.

> Sed apud Graecos remanens nondum est translatus,
> Hinc minori locus est hic Homero datus (ll. 162, 163).

And he adds that this 'Homerus minor' had been translated by the philosopher Pindar. We may compare with what is here said as to the true Homer not having been translated, a similar statement of Dante in Conv. I. vii. *ad fin.*, which was quoted *supra*, pp. 10, 11, where the few Homeric quotations occurring in Dante have already been sufficiently noticed. In Par. xxiii. 25–27, Mr. Butler contends that Dante is surely imitating Il. viii. 555 *seqq*. The resemblance is certainly striking, but cannot, I think, be deemed conclusive. If an imitation at all, it would no doubt be at second hand.

There is a passage in De Mon. I. x. *fin.* where Aristotle ('Philosophus') is quoted for words which he reproduces from

[1] Hugo von Trimberg was a schoolmaster at Bamberg, who wrote a *Registrum multorum Auctorum* in 1280 A. D. He was therefore an exact contemporary of Dante, and this makes his evidence as to the knowledge of Latin authors, and the estimation in which their works were then held, of peculiar interest and importance for us. (See further *s. v.* Horace.) This *Registrum* was a sort of doggrel poem in rhyme, written, as he says himself, 'in usum scholarum,' and intended to serve the same sort of function for Latin literature as the 'As in praesenti,' &c., of our younger days did for Latin accidence. It is a poem of 1,033 lines, preserved, I believe, in only one MS. It has been printed by Prof. Huemer in vol. 116 of the Akademie der Wissenschaften (1888). The author introduces himself modestly as—

> Auctorista minimus Hugo nuncupatus
> Cupiens scholaribus cunctis fore gratus.

Homer, though without naming him. Hence Dante is apparently unaware that the language is that of Homer. The passage occurs in Il. ii. 204, viz. Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω. See Aristotle, Metaph. Λ. 10 *fin.*

VIRGIL.

It is no part of our present purpose to deal with the interesting question of the part played by Virgil in the symbolism of Dante's poem, or of the conception which Dante himself had formed of him. It is well known that in the middle ages Virgil had become a legendary and mythical personage [1], chiefly conspicuous as a great magician [2], though still identified with the author of the Aeneid. This was itself subjected to vagaries of mystical interpretation [3], by which its true character was almost as completely disguised as that of its author. But although in the peculiar conception which Dante had formed of Virgil he was doubtless influenced by the popular and current beliefs, he was a genuine and thorough student of him as a classical author, and it is no idle boast when he puts into the mouth of Virgil the words,

> Così il canta
> L' alta mia Tragedìa in alcun loco:
> Ben lo sai tu, *che la sai tutta quanta.* (Inf. xx. 112-14.)

It does, however, bear upon our subject to notice that

[1] See the elaborate work of Comparetti, *Virgilio nel Medio Evo.* This has been recently translated into English.

[2] Mr. Morfill has kindly sent me the following information illustrative of this popular notion of Virgil. In old Bulgarian writings of the tenth century we find the expression *Verziolovo Kolo*, meaning the circle or place of necromancers. Also in old Servian songs we have *Verzino Kolo* in the same sense. In Welsh, Virgil appears as *Pheryll* (the *g* being omitted because the language has no palatals), and hence in old Welsh *fferylljaeth* or *fferylltjaeth* is found for 'alchemy.' There is no trace, I think, of this idea in Dante, except perhaps in the curious and obscure passage in which Virgil is associated with the sorceress Erichtho in Inf. ix. 22-4, on which Comparetti throws no light. See *inf.* under Lucan, No. 11.

[3] See Lubin, *Studi*, pp. 208 *seqq.*

Virgil is quoted by Dante (especially in the De Monarchia) as though his language was invested with almost the authority of Scripture [1]. One example must suffice. The well-known lines of Virgil, 'Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,' &c., Aen. vi. 852 *seqq.*, together with a similar passage from Aen. iv. 227–230, are quoted like a Scripture text, as a direct *proof* of God's purpose for the universal empire of Rome. Dante's language is—'*Propterea* satis persuasum est quod Romanus populus a natura ordinatus fuit ad imperandum. *Ergo* Romanus populus subiciendo sibi orbem, de iure ad imperium venit' (Mon. II. vii. *fin.*). Many similar passages might be adduced.

The explanation is that Dante regarded the Empire to be as much a divine institution as the Church, and the history of the Roman people to have been no less divinely ordered in preparation for the one, than the history of the Jewish people was for that of the other [2]. He distinctly assigns to classical authors a measure of 'inspiration,' though in less degree than that of Holy Scripture (see Mon. III. iii.). Thus Lucan, Ovid, and Livy are sometimes quoted as possessing an authority of this kind, though Virgil, as pre-eminently the great poet of the Empire, naturally stands on a higher pedestal than the rest. The Christian meaning commonly read into Ecl. iv. would support the view of his special inspiration. See Purg. xxii. ll. 64 *seqq.* Moreover Dante's frequent expressions of admiration and reverence for Virgil (such as Inf. i. 82–7, &c.), and his acknowledgements of his own poetic debt to him would further explain such a pre-eminence. But, as in the case of Scripture, Dante's indebtedness to Virgil is not to be measured by the number of direct quotations from his works, large though it be. Even a casual reader cannot fail to be struck with the numberless occasions when the scenery, personages, or incidents of Dante's imaginary journey are borrowed from Virgil, and particularly from Aeneid vi, which traverses to some extent the same ground. The Virgilian

[1] Note the expression 'divinus poeta noster,' in Mon. II. iii. l. 28. He timidly ventures to differ from him once in Mon. II. viii. l. 92. See also *infra*, No. 8. Compare his treatment of Aristotle, *supra*, p. 92.

[2] See *supra*, p. 27.

colouring of the descriptions of Cerberus, Charon, Minos, the Giants, the Furies, &c., will occur to every one.

Naturally, in the case of the *Divina Commedia* we are not so much concerned with direct and formal quotations as with poetical reminiscences, allusions, and imitations such as I have just referred to. It will probably, therefore, be more convenient to take the passages now to be discussed, at any rate those in the *Divina Commedia*, in connexion with such subjects or occasions as those just indicated.

(1)

I will begin therefore with a passage of thirty or forty lines in Aeneid, vi. 298 *seqq.*, which has left its trace in three different scenes in Dante. (1) In Inf. iii. we have the description of Charon and his boat and the spirits dropping into it like the multitudinous leaves of autumn, which has been fully discussed already (pp. 24, 25). (2) In Purg. ii. 94–102, the same passage, especially ll. 312–330, has evidently suggested the refusal of the angel to admit some souls to his boat for transport to Purgatory, which is described by Casella. The apparent arbitrariness of Charon's action (ll. 315, 316), afterwards explained (ll. 325–330), has also its parallel in the arbitrary, though admittedly just, action of the angel (Purg. ii. 94 *seqq.*). Note also how the immediate context, Purg. ii. 80, 81 :—

> Tre volte retro a lei le mani avvinsi,
> E tante mi tornai con esse al petto,

almost exactly reproduces Aeneid, vi. 700 :—

> Ter conatus ibi collo dare brachia circum,
> Ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago.

(3) Finally, the influence of the same passage, especially l. 329 :—

> Centum errant annos, volitantque haec littora circum,

may again be traced in Inf. xv. 38, 39, 'giace poi cent' anni,' &c.

(2)

The very beautiful scene of the Valley of the Kings in Purgatorio, Canto vii, seem certainly to have been suggested to Dante by Virgil, Aeneid, vi. 679 *seqq.* :—

> At pater Anchises penitus convalle virenti
> Inclusas animas superumque ad lumen ituras
> Lustrabat studio recolens, omnemque suorum
> Forte recensebat numerum, &c.

It is curious to observe as confirmatory of this suggestion that some comparatively indifferent details in the immediately preceding lines in Virgil have been adopted by Dante a little above. See ll. 672 *seqq.* :—

> Atque huic responsum paucis ita reddidit heros:
> Nulli certa domus; lucis habitamus opacis,
> Riparumque toros et prata recentia rivis
> Incolimus. Sed vos, si fert ita corde voluntas,
> Hoc superate iugum; et facili iam tramite sistam.
> Dixit, et ante tulit gressum camposque nitentes
> Desuper ostentat; dehinc summa cacumina linquunt.

Compare with this Purg. vii. 40–2 :—

> Rispose: 'Loco certo non c' è posto:
> Licito m' è andar suso ed intorno:
> Per quanto ir posso, a guida mi t' accosto.'

See again, l. 47 :—

> 'Se 'l mi consenti, io ti merrò ad esse.'

Then the last two lines in the latter quotation from Virgil, together with those quoted first, exactly describe the position to which Dante and Virgil were guided by Sordello, and from which they looked down on the illustrious spirits gathered in the beautiful valley below them. See ll. 65–8, 82–4, and especially 88–90. Besides the lines above quoted from Virgil, the longer description preceding (to which they refer) of the

> Locos laetos et amoena vireta
> Fortunatorum nemorum sedesque beatas (ll. 638, 639),

should be compared throughout with the scene depicted by

Dante. Among several other details, note the Christian equivalent of

Dextra laevaque per herbam
Vescentes, laetumque choro Paeana canentes (ll. 656, 657),

in

Salve Regina in sul verde e in su i fiori
Quivi seder cantando anime vidi (ll. 82, 83).

The following passage in the Paradiso reads almost like a comment on the contrast here indicated :—

Lì si cantò non Bacco, non Peana,
Ma tre Persone in divina natura,
Ed in una persona essa e l' umana (xiii. 25-27).

(3)

In connexion with the above passages we may compare the 'aurea bractea' with which Aeneas was armed by direction of the Sybil in Aeneid, vi. 140, 1; 209, with the Christian equivalent of the reed with which Dante was girt ('Be clothed with humility') by the advice of Cato, Purg. i. 94. Also the spontaneous renewal of the plant, Purg. i. 134–6, is borrowed from Aeneid, vi. 143, 'Primo avulso non deficit alter Aureus.' Nor must we omit the bathing of Dante's face with the dew, Purg. i. 95–6, 121 *seqq.*, and the corresponding act on the part of Aeneas, Aeneid, vi. 635, 6.

(4)

The very singular selection of Cato, as the guardian of Purgatory, though, as a Suicide, his place would naturally be found in the Seventh Circle of the Inferno, has given rise to much difficulty and discussion. I believe that the explanation is chiefly to be found in a line of Virgil, Aeneid, viii. 670 :—

Secretosque pios, his dantem iura Catonem,

especially when this is taken in connexion with the language of Lucan respecting Cato, and particularly such lines as these in Phars. ix. 554, 5 :—

Nam cui crediderim superos arcana daturos
Dicturosque magis quam sancto vera Catoni?

It will not be forgotten how much of the language of the repeated praises of Cato in the Convito (e.g. IV. v, vi, xxviii.) is derived from Lucan (*q. v. infra*).

Without entering further on the difficult question of Dante's choice of Cato as guardian of Purgatory, I will only observe that two points must be chiefly borne in mind. (1) Dante regarded the death of Cato as an act of supreme self-sacrifice for liberty, just as much as if he had given up his life in battle like the Decii, who, in De Mon. II. v, ll. 132 *seqq.*, are coupled with Cato. Cato's death is there described as 'inenarrabile sacrificium severissimi verae libertatis auctoris' (see further, *l. c.*, and note how (ll. 134–140) Dante rings the changes on the words *liber* and *libertas*). That it was effected by suicide, passes as it were out of sight, and becomes a merely accidental feature of the supreme sacrifice. Dante also quotes at the end of the chapter a passage from Cicero, de Off. i. 31, in which he declares that Cato's suicide was of a quite exceptional and justifiable character. Evidently such an act would stand on a different footing from such suicides as those of Pier delle Vigne and others condemned by Dante in Inf. xiii, or that which Aristotle censures in Nic. Eth. III. vii. 13. St. Augustine, De Civ. Dei, i. 23, discusses this question, but regards the suicide of Cato as due to 'infirmitas adversa non sustinens,' which is the point of view taken by Aristotle, *l. c.* See further, Purg. i. 71, 2:—

> Libertà va cercando, che è sì cara,
> Come sa chi per lei vita rifiuta.

Another point to remember is that Cato (like Beatrice herself, like Virgil, &c.) is idealized and allegorized, and so is partly real and partly ideal (and more largely the latter), as is the case with so many other persons and events in Dante.

(5)

Similarly I doubt not that the anomalous privilege accorded to the Trojan Rhipeus (whose natural place would of course be in Limbo), that he should be one of the five righteous rulers[1]

[1] The other four being Trajan, Hezekiah, Constantine, and William the Good of Sicily.

composing the eyebrow of the mystic eagle typifying Justice (see Par. xx. 68), is due to the words in which he is characterized by Virgil in Aeneid, ii. 426, 7 :—

> Rhipeus *iustissimus* unus
> Qui fuit in Teucris, et *servantissimus aequi.*

Compare with this the language in which Dante afterwards justifies this selection, l. 121 :—

> Tutto suo amor laggiù pose a drittura.

(6)

Inf. v. 61, 62; 85.

The treatment of Cato leads us to speak of a somewhat similar anomaly in the case of Dido, who, though a suicide, is punished for the lighter sin of incontinence. Doubtless in many cases the condemned are guilty of more sins than one, but as they cannot be represented as being in more than one place in Hell, they are generally found where their most conspicuous or heinous sin is punished. In the case of Dido, Dante was doubtless disposed to take a merciful view, from her association with Aeneas and the founding of the Roman line, but I think his peculiar treatment of her case is mainly due to an imitation of Virgil, Aeneid vi. There also there are places specially allotted to suicides (ll. 434–6), and also to ill-fated lovers (ll. 442 *seqq.*), but Virgil has put Dido among the latter, and not among the former. See especially l. 442 :—

> Hic quos durus amor crudeli tabe peredit,
> Secreti celant calles, et myrtea circum
> Silva tegit; curae non ipsa in morte relinquunt.

Compare with the first line, Inf. v. 69, 'Che amor di nostra vita dipartille;' while the concluding words might serve as a motto for the enduring love of Francesca and Paolo (see 105 and 135). Finally, with Aeneid, vi. 450 :—

> Inter quas Phoenissa recens a vulnere Dido
> Errabat,

compare l. 85 :—

> Cotali uscir della schiera ov' è Dido.

(7)

Another anomaly occurs in the position assigned to the giants surrounding the lowest pit of Hell (Inf. xxxi.). This is again, I think, to be explained by a reference to Virgil. Their crime was surely one of violence against the gods, like that of Capaneus, and we should have expected to find them also in the third Girone of the seventh Circle, yet they are in an intermediate place between the two Circles of Fraud. They are not exactly guardians of the ninth Circle, nor yet, though chained and bound, are they sharers in the punishment of the sinners inhabiting that circle, with whose particular type of sin they have indeed nothing in common. I think the explanation is, that here, as often elsewhere, Dante was influenced by Virgil, whose language in Aen. vi. 580, 81 seems to suggest this position for the giants.

> Hic genus antiquum terrae, Titania pubes,
> *Fulmine deiecti, fundo* volvuntur *in imo.*

Dante, it is true, does not adopt *volvuntur*, proposing to deal with the giants in a more striking and picturesque manner, but we have *fundo in imo* represented by *pozzo* in ll. 32, 42 ; and *fulmine deiecti* finds at least an echo in the statement

> Cui minaccia
> Giove nel cielo ancora quando tuona (l. 45),

which implies that they were *fulmine deiecti* originally.

(8)

The fable of Manto in Virgil and Dante.

Dante's treatment of the fable of Manto, from whom traditionally Mantua derived its name, is very curious. Apart from the unique instance of inaccuracy into which Dante has fallen by placing her in the Eighth Circle of the Inferno (Inf. xx.), and also in Limbo (Purg. xxii. 113), which does not concern us at present, he puts a curious story into the mouth of Virgil inconsistent with that poet's own account of the matter in the Aeneid. Also this is introduced in language

which makes it look like a 'Retractation' on the part of Virgil; in other words, Dante intentionally here corrects the Virgilian legend. Why he did so, or what other authority he was following, I am unable to say. The words put into the mouth of Virgil, implying a sort of 'retractation,' and calling Dante's special attention to the true form of the story about to be given, occur in Inf. xx. 57 and 97–102.

The Virgilian account (Aen. x. 198–200) is that Ocnus, son of the river Tiber and the prophetess Manto, founded Mantua, and called it after his mother's name.

> (Ocnus) Fatidicae Mantus et Tusci filius amnis,
> Qui muros matrisque dedit tibi, Mantua, nomen

But Dante identifies Manto with the daughter of Tiresias who bore that name, describes her as '*vergine* cruda,' and says that the scattered inhabitants of the neighbourhood gathered in a city which they built around her tomb, and called the city after her name. It will be seen that Dante's story differs from that of Virgil in many respects. The identification of the Italian with the Greek Manto is found in Servius's commentary on this passage of Virgil, whence Dante may have derived it[1]. Another tradition makes the Italian Manto to be a daughter of Hercules. The Greek tradition as to Manto, daughter of Tiresias, is that after the fall of Thebes she founded the worship of Apollo Clarius near Colophon, in Asia Minor, where she afterwards married. We need not be surprised at the identification of these two mythological persons of the same name, since in Christian hagiology nothing is more common than a similar confusion of distinct persons or traditions when associated by a common name. The probable confusion of two separate persons in the case of Santa Lucia in Inf. ii., would be an instance in point.

It is perhaps worth noticing that Statius in Theb. iv. 463 speaks of *innuba Manto*, with which we may compare Dante's *vergine cruda* (l. 82), and the various rites in which Statius describes her as assisting her father may perhaps be referred to in illustration of Dante's expression *far sue arti* (l. 86).

[1] See on this *infra*, under No. 26.

Also in Ovid, Met. vi. 157 (a context familiar to Dante, containing the stories of Arachne and Niobe) Ovid describes Manto as daughter of Tiresias,

Nam sata Tiresia, venturi praescia Manto, &c.

Possibly Dante may have wished to correct Virgil's account on the strength of his other authorities, Statius and Ovid.

(9)

There are many interesting points of resemblance between the foretellings of Dante's troubles by Brunetto Latini in Inf. xv, and by Cacciaguida in Par. xvii, with the similar warnings imparted to Aeneas by the Sybil in Aen. vi. Note especially in each case, (1) the encouraging assurance of ultimate success. Compare Inf. xv. 55, and Par. xvii. 65, 97–9, with Aen. vi. 95,

Tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito,
Quam tua te fortuna sinet:

and (2) the resigned and yet confident spirit with which the fateful warning is met. Compare too Inf. xv. 94 and Par. xvii. 22–7 with Aen. vi. 103,

Non ulla laborum,
O virgo, nova mi facies inopinave surgit;
Omnia praecepi, atque animo mecum ante peregi.

(10)

Dante's description of Cacus in Inf. xxv. 17 *seqq.* has evidently been suggested by Virgil Aen. viii. In the first place the curious blunder by which Dante describes him as a Centaur (l. 17) is probably due to the recollection of a misunderstood expression in Virgil, l. 194,

Semihominis Caci facies.

Dante again refers to Cacus as a Centaur in l. 28, 'non va co' suoi fratei per un cammino,' &c., thinking it necessary to explain why he is separated in his punishment from his brother Centaurs in the Seventh Circle. Then again line 24—

E quello *affoca* qualunque s' intoppa

is suggested by Aen. viii. 252 *seqq.*:—

> Faucibus ingentem fumum, mirabile dictu!
> Evomit involvitque domum caligine caeca,
> Prospectum eripiens oculis; glomeratque sub antro
> Fumiferam noctem commixtis igne tenebris.

(11)

Purg. iii. 55, 56. E mentre ch' ei teneva 'l viso basso,
E esaminava del cammin la mente.

Here there is a good deal of doubt both as to the reading and interpretation. But those who in l. 56, 'E esaminava del cammin la mente,' take 'la mente del cammin' together, appeal to the Virgilian 'arvorum ingenia' in Georg. ii. 177 in justification of the unusual expression. But this must be considered extremely doubtful; and, further, *del cammin* is most likely a sort of partitive genitive after *esaminava*, 'enquired or deliberated concerning the road'; as in Boccaccio, Decam. ii. 6, 'partitamente d' ogni sua passata vita l' esaminò.'

(12)

It has sometimes been thought that Dante may have borrowed the phrase 'dove il sol *tace*,' Inf. i. 60, from Aen. ii. 255, 'per amica *silentia* lunae,' at any rate supposing the interpretation of this latter to be 'when the moon was not shining.' But this is doubtful, and the reference to Virgil perhaps still more so.

(13)

The Christian application of Virgil, Ecl. iv, in Purg. xxii. 70, is of course much older than Dante, and is found (among other early Christian writers) in St. Augustine[1]. Its special association with the alleged conversion of Statius is peculiar to Dante,

[1] There is a very elaborate and exhaustive article on this subject by F. Piper in *Evangelischer Kalender* for 1862 (pp. 17–82), entitled 'Vergilius als Theolog und Prophet des Heidenthums in der Kirche.' Also Comparetti in his *Virgilio nel Medio Evo* (pp. 132, &c.) points out that Aristotle, Plato, Thucydides, and Sophocles have at different times been similarly treated, though not so generally and conspicuously as Virgil.

and it is difficult to suggest a motive for so singular an invention (see *supra*, p. 32). It may be worth while to add, as another illustration of the idea that heathen writers were guided to make unconscious prophecies, and so were 'pious beyond the intention of their thought,' the following curious suggestion of Benvenuto on the interpretation of Inf. xxiii. 124. Dante says that after they had looked on the prostrate figure of Caiaphas impaled or crucified, 'then I saw Virgil marvel over him who was thus ignominiously stretched in the form of a cross in the eternal exile.' Doubtless this is one of those graphic touches by which Dante often shows how intensely he realized the scenes and circumstances which he describes. He remembered that though Virgil knew the characters of Greek and Roman mythology and history, he was ignorant of the Gospel history, and therefore could know nothing of Caiaphas, or how he came to earn so ignominious a fate. Consequently Virgil 'marvelled' at the sight. This seems an adequate explanation. Benvenuto, however, suggests that ll. 116, 7 recalled to his memory his own words in Aen. v. 815, 'Unum pro multis dabitur caput,' and flashed a new meaning into this 'unconscious prophecy' which he had not realized before, and hence (in part at least) his wonderment. It is remarkable that St. John himself attaches a similar expansive significance to these words in Caiaphas's own mouth (c. xi. 49–52).

(14)

The beautiful instance of a Virgilian reminiscence in Purg. xxx. 49–51, when Dante first becomes conscious that Virgil has left him [1], in comparison with Georg. iv. 525–7, the parting

[1] It may perhaps be worth while here to correct a careless error sometimes found, viz. that Virgil takes his leave of Dante at the end of Canto xxvii. It is true that in that splendid passage we have the last words addressed to Dante by his guide, so that l. 139 is literally true:

'Non aspettar mio dir più, nè mio cenno.'

But Virgil is mentioned as still present in xxviii. 145:

'Io mi volsi diretro allora tutto
A' miei Poeti;'

and again in the symbolically significant statement of xxix. 55–7, where Virgil, i. e. Human Reason, is described as baffled and stupefied by the 'greatness of

scene of Orpheus and Euridice, has been already spoken of in the introductory remarks (see *supra*, p. 21). There is, it is true, very little evidence that Dante was familiar with the Georgics, but the episode of Orpheus and Euridice was one very likely to have been included in collections of 'Extracts,' or 'Florilegia.'

(15)

In Inf. x. 58 *seqq.*, the scene between Cavalcanti and Dante, though not directly copied from that between Andromache and Aeneas in Aen. iii. 310 *seqq.*, is surely suggested by it.

> Verane te facies, verus mihi nuntius affers,
> Nate dea? vivisne? aut, si lux alma recessit,
> Hector ubi est?

The expression 'lux alma recessit,' to express death, seems to be echoed in the paraphrastic description of life in l. 69:

> Non fiere gli occhi suoi lo dolce lome.

(16)

Another point noticeable about Dante's Virgilian references, indicating his minute acquaintance with the Aeneid, is the frequency with which Virgilian epithets are reproduced, often, as far as one can judge, merely as being thus familiar. Some of them are discussed elsewhere, so I will here simply collect the chief illustrations of this habit which I have noticed, most of which need no further comment.

Compare—

Aen. iii. 522	humilem Italiam	*with* Inf. i. 106 umile Italia
— vi. 734	carcere caeco	Purg. xxii. 103 carcere cieco
— vi. 179	antiquam silvam	Purg. xxviii. 23 selva antica
— xi. 182	miseris mortalibus (also in Geor. iii. 66)	Par. xxviii. 2 miseri mortali
— viii. 686	littore rubro	Par. vi. 79 lito rubro
— vi. 443	secreti calles	Inf. x. 1 secreto calle

---

the revelation of divine things. I suspect that, with a similar symbolical intention, Dante imagined Virgil or Human Reason to have retired on the advent of Beatrice, typifying Revelation or Theology, i. e. at xxx. 32; but Dante first becomes conscious of his having disappeared when, at l. 43, he turns to seek for him, as he has been accustomed to do before in all moments of doubt and difficulty. Then follows the beautiful passage referred to in the text.

Aen. i. 544 Aeneas . . . quo iustior alter Nec pietate fuit, &c.	Inf. i. 73, 4 quel giusto Figliuol d' Anchise
— vi. 320 vada livida	Inf. iii. 98 livida palude
— iii. 2, 3 superbum Ilium	Inf. i. 75 superbo Ilion[1]
— vi. 534 tristes sine sole domos.	Inf. viii. 120 dolenti case (in same application).

So again, in Epist. vi. § 4, l. 104, it is clear that 'Pergama rediviva' is a Virgilian reminiscence. In no less than three passages Virgil speaks of '*recidiva* Pergama' (Aen. iv. 344; vii. 322; x. 58); and in the first and last of these it is to be noted that a variant 'rediviva' is found. It is probable that this was the reading in the MS. used by Dante. Again compare 'praesaga mens,' Epist. vi. § 4, l. 115, with 'praesaga mali mens,' Aen. x. 843.

In Inf. xiii. 140, it has been suggested that the expression 'strazio disonesto,' to describe the mutilation of the nameless suicide, may have been derived from Aen. vi. 497, where the minute description, after the manner of Virgil (see under No. 18), of the manifold details of the mutilation of Deiphobus ends with 'et truncas inhonesto vulnere nares.' If this be so, it would explain the word *disonesto* having this unusual meaning. It is found in its more ordinary sense at Par. xxvi. 140. Finally we may add further the expression used by Cacciaguida to Dante, 'O sanguis meus,' Par. xv. 28; which seems to be imitated from Aen. vi. 836, 'Proiice tela manu, sanguis meus.'

In regard to the first of the passages quoted above,

Di quell' *umile Italia* fia salute,

the meaning of the words italicized has been much disputed and very variously explained by the commentators, both ancient and modern. Among the former (passing over several more far-fetched suggestions) we may note: (1) *umile* ironically = *superba*. So *Bocc.*, *Lan.*, and *Buti* (alternative).

[1] There are two other passages where the *pride* of Troy is spoken of by Dante, Inf. xxx. 13, 14:

E quando la fortuna volse in basso
L' altezza de' Troian che tutto ardiva,

and Purg. xii. 61–3, where Troy is given as an example of humbled pride (*superbia*).

But this would be out of harmony with the tone of the passage. (2) *umile* = 'abject' or 'downtrodden.' So *Ott.*, *Comm. Anon.*, *Barg.*, *Buti* (alternative), *Cast.* I believe that Dante's chief reason for choosing this epithet is that he is consciously quoting a well-known line of Virgil; and the further description of Italy which follows is made up of a series of references to persons and incidents occurring in the Aeneid (see ll. 107, 8). But I do not doubt that when Dante thus gracefully puts this quotation into Virgil's own mouth, he meant us to 'read between the lines,' and to attach a deeper meaning to the words 'low-lying Italy' than that which they originally bore, as merely a description of the scenery of the 'low-lying' Apulian coast, as Aeneas approached it from the sea:

> Cum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus
> Italiam.

(17)

In connexion with these repetitions of Virgilian epithets we may put together several cases of resemblances in other points of detail or in isolated expressions.

First let us compare the descriptions of Cocytus and Styx in Virgil and Dante.

In Aen. vi. 323 we have

> Cocyti stagna alta vides *Stygiamque paludem*,

and again in l. 369,

> *Stygiamque* innare *paludem*.

Now compare Dante—

> Fanno *Cocito*; e qual sia quello *stagno*, &c. (Inf. xiv. 119),

and again—

> Una *palude* fa, che ha nome *Stige* (Inf. vii. 106).

I think it is probable that we have a sort of echo of a quotation in Inf. i. 33, where Dante says of the *lonza* or lynx.

> di pel *maculato* era coperta.

Compare this with Aen. i. 323,

maculosae tegmine lyncis,

where all the words of the passage in Virgil reappear, though in a different combination.

So again, when Dante says in describing the Furies (Inf. ix. 48), 'Tesifone è nel *mezzo*,' it is not, I think, impossible that he may have had in his mind the ring or echo of the Virgilian line, 'Pallida *Tisiphone media* inter millia saevit' (Aen. x. 761), though varying the application of the word. Very similar to this is the comparison already pointed out, *supra*, p. 19, between Aen. vi. 200 and Purg. xxiv. 101.

We have perhaps another instance of the reproduction of a Virgilian phrase in the difficult and variously explained expression, 'religione della montagna,' in Purg. xxi. 41, 2. This is probably suggested by 'Religio . . . loci' in Aen. viii. 349, 50.

The last case I will mention under this head is the possible reminiscence in respect of the feeble voice attributed to the shade of Virgil himself in Inf. i. 63—

'Chi per lungo silenzio parea fioco'—

of the similar circumstance noted by Virgil in regard to the ghosts in Aen. vi. 492, 3—

Pars tollere *vocem*
Exiguam: inceptus clamor frustratur hiantes.

I ought to add that *fioco* is undoubtedly here to be translated 'feeble' (in accordance with its regular usage by Dante), and not 'hoarse,' as it is sometimes wrongly given.

A similar idea is found in Lucan, where Erichtho recommends that for purposes of vaticination a shade recently dead should be evoked, that it may speak more clearly:

Ut modo defuncti tepidique cadaveris ora
Plena voce sonent; ne membris sole perustis
Auribus incertum feralis strideat umbra.
(Phars. vi. 621–623).

(18)

It will next be noticed how Dante sometimes combines passages or incidents which in Virgil are found in collocation

(more or less) but not in connexion. Thus the story of Polydorus and the episode of the Harpies occur close together in Virgil, Aeneid, Bk. iii, but they are not connected either in time or place. Dante has of course borrowed the idea of imprisoning the souls of suicides in trees from the story of Polydorus, but he has added a fresh element of horror by supposing the Harpies to infest the wood and lacerate the sensitive and bleeding branches. Thus, either from an imperfect recollection of Virgil, or much more probably, of deliberate intention, he has united two incidents of Virgil's narrative which happened to be in a certain proximity of context. If this be the explanation, the elaborate guesses of the commentators as to the symbolism of the Harpies is to a great extent beside the point. At any rate the symbolism plays a secondary part.

Another small point may be worth calling attention to. Bartolini has well compared the 'stupendous simplicity' of Inf. xiii. 45,

Stetti come l' uom che teme,

with the elaborate details of Aen. iii. 29, 30:

Mihi frigidus horror
Membra quatit, gelidusque coit formidine sanguis.

The contrast is characteristic, and it will be remembered how both Macaulay and Ruskin have drawn attention to a similar contrast when comparing Milton and Dante. (See *infra*, pp. 212, 3.)

(19)

The following seems to be another case. In Aen. ii. Sinon denounces the fraud and treachery of Ulysses ('pellacis Ulyxi') in respect of the Trojan horse and the theft of the Palladium. Dante represents him in Hell as expiating precisely these two crimes. In the same context Sinon deplores, as one of the cruellest features of his feigned calamity, that he would never see his home and those dear to him again:

Nec mihi iam patriam antiquam spes ulla videndi,
Nec dulces natos exoptatumque parentem (ll. 137, 138).

Dante transfers the sentiment from Sinon to Ulysses, and makes it refer to his self-imposed absence from home, due to

his consuming desire for adventure by which these home-longings, however strong, were conquered :

> Nè dolcezza di figlio, nè la pieta
> Del vecchio padre, nè il debito amore,
> Lo qual dovea Penelope far lieta[1].
>
> (Inf. xxvi. 94–96).

(20)

Another instance of combined passages occurs in regard to the descriptions by Virgil of Minos and Rhadamanthus. These occur in two different parts of Aen. vi, the former ll. 431–3, and the latter ll. 566 *seqq*. Dante unites some of the features of both in his description of Minos in Inf. v. 7–10. From the former we have his position, 'in limine primo,' and the office of judgement, 'vitasque et crimina discit.' Compare

> Esamina le colpe nell' entrata.

From the latter, the enforced confession of the culprits,

> Castigatque auditque dolos subigitque fateri (l. 567),

and the immediate supervention of the punishment (l. 570),

> Continuo sontes ultrix accincta flagello
> Tisiphone quatit insultans, &c.

(See Inf. v. ll. 7–15.) The actual form of its infliction is varied

[1] It will be perhaps interesting to notice the very curious comment upon this passage made by Pietro di Dante. He compares it with Aen. ii. 666 :

> Ascanium patremque meum iuxtaque Creusam,

and he observes that both Virgil and Dante are careful to adopt the same order of enumeration, *son, father, wife*. He further supposes their common intention to be to indicate the relative strength of affection, beginning with the strongest—'magis filio, inde patri, postea uxori inclinamur.' He goes on to quote a passage from Ovid where the order is reversed, but as he introduces the quotation with 'unde' he appears to draw the same inference from it :

> Tres sumus imbelles numero ; sine viribus uxor,
> Laertesque senex, Telemachusque puer. (Heroid. i. 97, 98.)

It seems obvious to remark (especially with the converse order in Ovid before one) that if any significance is to be attached to the order in Virgil and Dante, it is quite as easy and perhaps more natural to argue that it is one of climax. At the same time it is interesting to find Dante's son Pietro making this singular suggestion as to the lower position in affection assigned to the wife, because the absence of any allusion by Dante to his own wife Gemma has sometimes been the subject of unfavourable remark (see *Dante and his Early Biographers*, p. 18). Pietro may have had an 'object lesson' at home to justify his generalization !

by Dante, who has introduced the grotesque incident of the lashing and winding of the enormous tail of Minos. Also his representation of him as a grinning and grotesque fiend is of course not found in Virgil; but, as I have remarked elsewhere, this and a similar transformation in other cases is probably suggested by the language of St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 20, that the objects of Gentile worship are 'devils.'

I propose next to call attention to the use of some Virgilian similes 'borrowed' (as the phrase is) by Dante.

(21)

The comparison of the spirits in Charon's boat to the falling leaves in autumn has already been discussed *supra*, pp. 23–25, to which reference may be made.

(22)

Another instance will be found in Canto v. ll. 82–5, where the very beautiful comparison of Francesca and Paolo to doves flying to their nest is founded on one in Virgil, as we may certainly infer from two or three points of distinct resemblance, in which, to use my previous metaphor, the language of Dante contains an 'echo' of that of Virgil.

Quali colombe dal disio chiamate,
Con l' ali alzate (*al.* aperte[1]) e *ferme*, al *dolce nido*
Vegnon per l' aer *dal voler portate.*

The passage in Virgil is

Qualis spelunca subito commota *columba*,
Cui domus et *dulces* latebroso in pumice *nidi*,
Fertur in arva volans plausumque exterrita pennis
Dat tecto ingentem, mox aere lapsa quieto
Radit iter liquidum *celeres neque commovet alas.*
(Aen. v. 213-217.)

[1] As to the variants *alzate* and *aperte*, I regret that my attention was not called to them in time to collect more evidence as to their MS. support. To judge from my collations of the Oxford and Cambridge MSS. the latter has not much. If Dante means to emphasize the absence of apparent motion of the wings in the gliding sweep of their flight, *aperte* would seem to express the idea more accurately, but I should not venture to adopt the reading on this ground without further external evidence than I at present possess.

Note the correspondence of the words italicised, and further observe how Dante reproduces the image of the motionless wings (celeres neque commovet alas) not only in the words '*ali* alzate (or "aperte") e *ferme*,' 'with wings poised and motionless,' but also in the picturesque expression, if I rightly understand the words, '*dal voler portate*.' They seem to move, like the τιτυσκόμεναι φρεσὶ νῆες of the Phaeacians (Odyss. viii. 556), of their own will, without effort, without any external or visible means of propulsion.

The comparison of the flight of the dove is used for a very different purpose in Virgil. To it is likened a ship which having run upon a rock is thrust off first into the troubled water, and then floats as smoothly over the open sea as the gliding flight of the dove. Dante has gone beyond the superficial similarity of the outward action, and has brought in all the beautiful and tender feelings suggested by the *homeward* flight of the doves, which he emphasizes by the words 'dal disio chiamate,' 'at affection's call.' Note that the *disio*[1] includes the 'Heimweh' (as the German would say) for the *dolce nido*, as well as thoughts of their young brood, an idea so beautifully expanded by Dante himself in the opening lines of Par. xxiii. (ll. 1–9). It will be remembered that the terrified abandonment of its home by the dove is one of the chief features in the Virgilian simile. One feels that, beautiful as the Virgilian passage is in its way, the resemblance of the things compared in Dante is much fuller and deeper and more appropriate. It is not impossible that Dante may have had in his memory another well-known place of Virgil, where two doves in company are described, viz. Aen. vi. 190–2; 202, 3, and that he may have combined into one simile some of the features of both passages, but in any case he has added many new and beautiful touches of his own.

[1] I would strongly protest against the lower sense given to *disio* by so many early and late commentators, i. e. ἐρὼς rather than στοργή. The idea here would introduce a sadly discordant note, and a train of most inappropriate associations. See on this Foscolo's *Discorso*, p. 315.

(23)

Purg. xxxii. 40–42. La coma sua, che tanto si dilata
Più quanto più è su, fora dagl' Indi
Nei boschi lor per altezza ammirata.

Here we have, I think, an evident imitation of the following lines of Virgil:—

Aut quos Oceano propior gerit India lucos,
Extremi sinus orbis, ubi aera vincere summum
Arboris haud ullae iactu potuere sagittae. (Georg. ii. 122-4.)

Dante uses the comparison of the huge trees of India to describe the height of his mystic tree, but the reference to the arrow's flight is omitted here, though it is perhaps not accidental that it is introduced a few lines before (ll. 34–36) for a different purpose, viz. as a measure of horizontal distance:—

Forse in tre voli tanto spazio prese
Disfrenata saetta, quanto, &c.

Next follow two instances in which some difficulty arises as to the meaning attached by Dante to the passages which he quotes.

(24)

Purg. xxii. 40, 41. Per che non reggi tu, o sacra fame
Dell' oro, l' appetito dei mortali?

Compare this with the well-known passage in Aen. iii. 56—

Quid non mortalia pectora cogis,
Auri sacra fames!

The speaker here is Statius, and he quotes to Virgil these words of his own, gratefully attributing to their influence his recovery from the vice of prodigality. It is very difficult, however, to get the sense of Virgil's passage out of Dante's language, though it seems at first to correspond word for word with the original. Various ways of translating l. 40 have been suggested, as well as an alteration of the text, e. g. to read '*A che.*' Nor again is it easy to see how the language of Virgil could act as a check upon prodigality, since it is obviously directed against avarice, which Statius says was already '*partita troppo da me*' (l. 34). Is it not just possible

that this is a sort of misquotation by Dante? For *Per che* or *Perchè* is the natural equivalent to *Quid*, though in a different sense of the word from that which it bears in the Virgilian context, viz. = 'why.' Even so, to make the passage serve as a text for a homily against prodigality, the word *reggi*, and possibly *sacra* as well, must be taken in a sense not intended by Virgil, i.e. 'Why dost thou not regulate or govern,' &c. It must be acknowledged that this quotation involves great difficulties. We seem compelled to suppose either a misquotation from imperfect memory of the original, or else a distortion of sense such as is sometimes met with in theological controversy in the use of so-called 'proof-texts [1].'

(25)

Conv. II. vi. l. 121. 'Figlio, virtù mia, figlio del sommo Padre, che li dardi di Tifeo non curi.'

Here at any rate Dante misunderstands and mistranslates in a very curious manner the passage which he is quoting from Virgil. It is found in Aen. i. 664, 5 :

> Nate, meae vires, mea magna potentia, solus,
> Nate, Patris summi qui tela Typhoia temnis.

Thus Dante takes (1) *patris summi* to be the genitive after *Nate* instead of after *tela*, so making Cupid to be the son of Jupiter ; and (2) he understands *tela Typhoia* to be the darts thrown *by*, and not *at* Typhoeus.

(25 a)

De Mon. II. v. ll. 90 seqq. Fabricius . . . pauper exsistens, *pro fide qua Reipublicae tenebatur*, auri grande pondus oblatum derisit, ac derisum, verba sibi convenientia fundens, despexit et refutavit. Huius etiam memoriam confirmavit Poeta noster in sexto, cum caneret :

> 'parvoque potentem
> Fabricium.'

Though Dante appeals to Virgil only, yet the details given respecting Fabricius come from some other source. These are

[1] It is perhaps worth noting that according to the usual explanation of Ecl. viii. 41 (Ut vidi! ut perii!) Virgil is himself supposed to have misunderstood and mistranslated the passage of Theocritus (ὡς ἴδον ὡς ἐμάνην) which he is reproducing.

repeated in Conv. IV. v. ll. 107 *seqq.* ('Chi dirà che fosse senza divina spirazione, Fabrizio infinita quasi moltitudine d' oro rifiutare, *per non volere abbandonare sua patria*?'). There are two other references to Fabricius—(1) as an example against avarice in Purg. xx. 25–27; (2) in De Mon. II. xi. l. 56, where he has a passing notice as being the champion of the Romans in their 'duellum' against the Greeks led by Pyrrhus.

I have no doubt that the details given above are derived from St. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, V. xviii. Indeed it is evident that the two chapters, De Mon. II. v. and Conv. IV. v., are constructed throughout on the model of this chapter of St. Augustine. He there brings together many instances of heroic virtue among the Romans, accomplished 'pro civitatis terrenae gloria,' in order to show that if Christians fall short of these it is a shame to them, if they emulate them it is nothing to boast of. Dante, in the two chapters referred to, adduces similar examples to prove the divine influence and guidance vouchsafed to the 'chosen people' of Rome[1]. In the De Mon. his examples are Cincinnatus, Fabricius, Camillus, Brutus, Mucius, the Decii, and Cato. In the Convito the same, with the addition of the Drusi, Curius, and Regulus. Now it is to be observed that *every one* of these is cited by St. Augustine, except the Drusi, Curius, and Cato. (The suicide of Cato being condemned by St. Augustine a few chapters before, he was not likely to have been held up for admiration here. The Drusi and Decii are coupled together by Dante in the same sentence, probably as suggested by Virg. Aen. vi. 825. On this see below under No. 36.) Further, St. Augustine quotes in reference to Brutus, Virg. Aen. vi. 821 *seqq.* So also does Dante (De Mon. *l. c.* l. 119). We are not surprised therefore to find a correspondence between Dante's language about Fabricius and that of St. Augustine. Compare with the words italicised above—'cum Fabritium didicerit tantis muneribus Pyrrhi regis Epirotarum, promissa etiam quarta parte regni, *a Romana civitate non potuisse divelli.*' Observe, too, that both St. Augustine and Dante associate the 'gran rifiuto' of Fabricius with

[1] See Conv. *l. c.* ll. 105, 120, 129, 139, 146 *seqq.*, 176 *seqq.* De Mon. *l. c.* ll. 34–42, 70 *seqq.*

Pyrrhus, not with the Samnites, as in the notes of Servius on Aen. vi. 845, and also in Val. Max. IV. iii. §§ 5, 6. The latter mentions Fabricius and Curius together, and (though afterwards connecting Fabricius and Pyrrhus) tells the story of the refusal of the gold in both cases in relation to the Samnites. Servius simply transfers to Fabricius *totidem verbis* the anecdote of Curius refusing the Samnite gold, together with the 'verba convenientia' by which the refusal was accompanied. Possibly this expression in Dante may be an echo of that story, but I find no other evidence of Dante having confused Fabricius and Curius, as is sometimes stated.

This must be my apology for going at such length into the probable source of Dante's information about Fabricius. It is noticeable that Curius is one of Dante's examples which does not correspond with those found in St. Augustine. Dante probably took the story of Curius from Cicero, de Sen. §§ 55, 56. Fabricius is not mentioned there, nor, as far as I can find, is any such anecdote related of him anywhere in Cicero, though he is described as finding 'paupertas . . . tolerabilis' in Tusc. Disp. III. 23. I see then no reason for supposing that Dante confused the two legends, but rather that he derived his knowledge of them from entirely different sources.

(26)

Dante's probable use of the Commentary of Servius.

The mention in the last paragraph of the Commentary of Servius suggests to me to put together here two or three cases in which I suspect that Dante may have been indebted to that Commentary for information supplementary to that which the bare text of Virgil would have supplied.

(*a*) Dante says of Achilles in Inf. v. 66:

> Che con amore al fine combatteo;

and he implies in ll. 67–69 that he was one of those who lost their lives through love. I do not find anything like this in Virgil's text, but Servius in his notes on Aen. iii. 322, and again on vi. 57, distinctly declares that Achilles was slain by Paris in

the temple of Apollo, whither he had gone to receive Polyxena as his bride. The same story is also, however, to be found at length in Dictys, de bello Troiano, Bk. IV. chs. x. and xi.; and in Dares, § 34. In the former we read—(Achilles *loquitur*) 'dolo me atque insidiis Deiphobus atque Alexander Polyxenae gratia circumvenere.'

(*b*) Again, why is Antenor regarded by Dante as a traitor so typical and conspicuous as to give his name to one of the four divisions in the lowest circle of hell, viz. that containing traitors to their country? Moreover Dante describes the treacherous murder of Jacopo del Cassero by Azzone of Este as having been done 'in grembo agli Antenori' (Purg. v. 75) with evident allusion to the suitability of the spot for such a deed. Now there is nothing to explain this in Virgil, where Antenor is only mentioned in Aen. i. 242 *seqq.*, a passage where Aeneas contrasts his unhappy and futile wanderings with the successful settlement of Antenor at Patavium. But Servius in his note, *h. l.*, explains the point of this complaint to be that Antenor betrayed his country on more occasions than one, and yet he prospered, while Aeneas was persecuted by fate. 'Si regnat proditor, cur pius vagatur?' May not Dante have derived his information from this source[1]?

(*c*) Once more, it has already been noted (*supra*, p. 174) that one feature at least in Dante's amplification or rectification of the Virgilian legend of Manto—her identification with the daughter of Tiresias—may possibly have been derived from Servius on Aen. x. 198.

(*d*) Another possible case was suggested by Mr. Paget Toynbee in a letter to the *Academy* (Dec. 2, 1893). Dante mentions in Inf. xxxi. ll. 94, 108, &c., Fialte, i.e. Ephialtes, among the Giants who endeavoured to storm heaven. Now his name is not found in Virgil, Lucan, or Statius. Mr. Toynbee thinks that Dante may have obtained this name either (1) from the Culex, l. 234:

Devinctum maestus procul aspiciens Ephialten

[1] Again it should be stated that both in Dictys and Dares the treachery of Antenor is spoken of at length.

(this being no doubt regarded in Dante's time as a genuine work of Virgil); or (2) from the note of Servius to Georg. i. 280:

> Et coniuratos coelum rescindere fratres—
>
> 'Othum et Ephialtem dicit, qui fuerunt filii Neptuni . . . confixi sagittis Apollinis et Dianae.'

As to the passage from the Culex, it might be suggested that in the elaborate description of the chains by which Ephialtes is bound (Inf. xxxi. ll. 85–90, 96), in contrast with Antaeus, who is 'disciolto' (l. 101), we have possibly an echo of the epithet 'devinctum.' The epithet 'Vinctus' is also applied to his brother Othus in the previous line of the Culex.

(*e*) Perhaps Dante may have obtained from Servius his knowledge of the meaning of the names Phlegethon and Styx. On Aen. vi. 265 Servius says, 'Per Phlegethonta . . . ignem significat'; and on Aen. vi. 134, 'A tristitia Styx dicta est.' Compare Inf. xiv. 134, 'il bollor dell' acqua rossa,' in reference to Phlegethon (cf. xii. 101, 2; xv. 2); and vii. 107, 'Questo tristo ruscel,' in reference to Styx (cf. vii. 121–4).

It remains only to speak of a few passages which may be used, or which it has sometimes been proposed to use, for the determination of the text.

(27)

Inf. ii. 59, 60. Di cui la fama ancor nel mondo dura,
E durerà quanto il moto (*al.* mondo) lontana.

Foscolo and others have defended *moto* by a supposed reminiscence on the part of Dante of Virgil's description of 'Fama' in Aen. iv. 173 *seqq.*, and in particular of the expression in l. 175, '*Mobilitate* viget.' It is to be observed that this passage is definitely quoted by Dante in Conv. I. iii. l. 76, 'Che la Fama vive per essere mobile.' On the strength of the citation the suggestion of the Edd. Mil. (boldly adopted by Giuliani) that we should read *vige* instead of *vive* is tempting, but perhaps hardly justifiable in the absence of any MS. support.

(28)

Inf. iii. 31. Ed io, ch' avea d' orror (*al.* error) la testa cinta.

While the reading *orror* is preferable on other grounds also, it is supported by Scartazzini by a reference to the Virgilian expression in Aen. ii. 559:

'At me tum primum saevus circumstetit horror.'

But I think we might also, and perhaps even more aptly (though the verbal resemblance is not quite so close), refer to Aen. vi. 557–561, since the whole passage there has several points of resemblance to that before us. Aeneas, like Dante here, stands at the 'vestibulum' of the place of torment:

Hinc exaudiri gemitus et saeva sonare
Verbera, tum stridor ferri tractaeque catenae.
Constitit Aeneas, strepitumque *exterritus* hausit. (ll. 557-559.)

Then, again, compare the question of Aeneas to his guide in the next two lines:

Quae scelerum facies? o virgo, effare; quibusve
Urgentur poenis? quis tantus plangor ad auras? (ll. 560, 561)

with the appeal of Dante:

Dissi: 'Maestro, che è quel ch' i' odo?
E che gent' è, che par nel duol sì vinta?' (ll. 32, 33.)

Finally, compare 'tantus plangor ad auras' with—

Facevano un tumulto, il qual s'aggira
Sempre in quell' aria senza tempo tinta (ll. 28, 29).

(29)

Inf. iv. 140, 1. E vidi Orfeo,
Tullio e *Lino* e Seneca morale.

The fact that not only is Linus mentioned by Virgil, but also that he is very definitely associated with Orpheus in Ecl. iv. 55, 6 (an Eclogue with which Dante was very familiar), may, I think, fairly be used as a subsidiary argument for reading *Linus* (and not *Livius*, &c.) in this passage. Linus is again mentioned with honour by Virgil in Ecl. vi. 67 [1].

[1] Also St. Augustine twice mentions Orpheus, Linus, and Musaeus together as 'theologi poetae' (De Civ. Dei, xviii. ch. 14 and 37).

(30)

Inf. ix. 70. Li rami schianta, abbatte, e porta fuori.

In support of 'porta fuori' as against the feeble *fiori*, or *i fiori*, Scartazzini refers to Georg. ii. 441,

Quas animosi Euri assidue *franguntque feruntque.*

The resemblance is hardly close enough to afford much of an argument, even if there were more evidence than there is of familiarity on the part of Dante with the Georgics. In any case the reading *fuori* is firmly enough established on other grounds.

(31)

The reading '*stretto* calle' in Inf. x. 1, which is found in several editions, though not (as far as I know) in many MSS., is probably a copyist's correction from a reminiscence of Inf. xviii. 100, and it is also perhaps rather more obvious in meaning than *secreto*. But in any case the latter is very strongly confirmed by the probable recollection by Dante of Virgil, Aen. vi. 443: 'Secreti celant calles.'

(32)

In De Mon. II. iii. l. 42, the words 'summa sequar *vestigia* rerum,' though not formally introduced as a quotation, are evidently taken from Virgil, Aen. i. 342: 'summa sequar *fastigia* rerum.' *Vestigia* seems to be due to a slip of memory in quotation, as I do not find any such variant recorded.

(33)

There is an interesting case of an inferior reading found in Dante's text of Virgil in De Mon. II. iii. l. 102, where the lines Aen. iii. 339, 340 are quoted. The latter line is left unfinished in the best MSS., thus:

Quem tibi iam Troia . . . . .

In inferior MSS. it is filled up—'peperit fumante (*al.* florente) Creusa'; and so Dante quotes it:

Quem tibi iam Troia peperit fumante Creusa[1]?

[1] Compare a similar case noted under Ovid (No. 15) in reference to Purg. xxxiii. 49.

(34)

In Conv. III. xi. l. 159, in a quotation of Virgil Aen. ii, the old editions have:—'che chiama *Enea* (so *all* the MSS. are said to read): "O luce" (ch' era atto), "e speranza delli Trojani" (ch' è passione).' The passage in Virgil, Aen. ii. 281, 2, runs thus:

> O lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum,
> Quae tantae tenuere morae? quibus *Hector* ab oris
> Exspectate venis?

Monti in his 'Saggio' (since followed in the main by later editors), corrects *Enea* into *Ettore*, and proceeds: '"O luce" (ch' era atto), "o speranza delli Trojani" (ch' è passione).' This passage seems to me to afford a good illustration of some of the limits within which corrections may or may not be introduced on the strength of the evidence of quotations. The latter correction, i.e. '*o* speranza' for '*e* speranza,' appears to me legitimate and indeed certain; since (1) the change is infinitesimal; and (2) slight though it is, it affects the framework and rhetorical character of the sentence, which no one quoting it would be likely to fail to reproduce. The other change, substituting 'Hector' for 'Aeneas,' in the teeth of all MS. authority, appears to me quite unjustifiable. There is nothing in the passage as far as it is quoted (which may well be from memory[1], as it contains only a few words, and *Dardaniae* is omitted) to show who is addressed, and the words in themselves would be equally appropriate to either name. Thus such a slight inaccuracy or slip of memory as the substitution of Aeneas for Hector may quite naturally have taken place. Indeed, it would be just parallel to what is supposed to have occurred in Nic. Eth. II. ix. 3, where Aristotle substitutes Calypso for Circe. Yet I imagine no sober critic would propose to correct the text in that case.

[1] Certainly either Dante, or whoever else wrote 'Enea' did not refer to the passage, as it will be seen (as *supra*) that Hector in the vocative case appears in the very next line. Aeneas is the speaker. Apart from the context, the words might appear (either to Dante or a copyist) as more likely to be addressed to Aeneas than any one else.

(35)

Conv. IV. v. ll. 88 seqq. Se consideriamo li sette regi che prima la governarono, Romolo, Numa, Tullo, Anco, e li tre (*al.* re) Tarquinii, &c.

Compare Virgil, Aen. vi. 777–819 (shield of Aeneas).

In this passage Virgil enumerates the early kings of Rome as represented on the shield of Aeneas. We have Romulus (778 *seqq.*); Numa, clearly described, though not mentioned by name (809 *seqq.*); then Tullus (815), and Ancus (816). These are followed by 'Tarquinios reges' (818). It will be observed that Servius Tullius is not mentioned. Now it is very singular that in Dante's enumeration of the seven kings of Rome in the passage above quoted a similar omission occurs[1]. This can hardly be accidental, and we cannot doubt that (as Mr. Paget Toynbee has pointed out[2]) Dante must have had this passage of Virgil in his mind. But I am inclined further to think that the Virgilian expression 'Tarquinios *reges*' (818) very strongly supports the reading 'li *re* Tarquinii,' in Conv. IV. v. l. 91, which, before my attention was called to the probable imitation of Virgil, I was disposed to reject, believing it to be a purely conjectural alteration of Dr. Witte, to avoid the historical inaccuracy of '*tre* Tarquinii.' But I am now prepared to advocate '*re* Tarquinii'—(1) on the ground of the reproduction of the Virgilian 'Tarquinios reges' from a passage which Dante is pretty certainly shown to have had in his mind, and from a context with which quotations in the De Mon. (see Index) prove him to have been familiar.

(2) The very fact that Livy and Orosius[3] distinctly mention

[1] This passage affords a singular instance of the almost incredible licence with which Giuliani has treated the text of the author whom he was professing to 'edit.' He deliberately inserts the name of Servius Tullius, without a word of warning in the text or notes that it is thus arbitrarily introduced. So in l. 123 (l. 90 ed. Giuliani) he calmly alters *Drusi* into *Fabi* on the ground that the latter are more conspicuous among Roman heroes than the former! Fortunately he is too well pleased with this emendation to omit the mention of it in his notes, so that here we have some warning.

[2] In the *Academy*, Feb. 23, 1895.

[3] And we may add Florus, if, as some imagine, Dante was acquainted with his work. But the supposed evidence for this is extremely slender.

Servius Tullius would lead us to suppose that in this passage there was present to Dante's mind some other authority or model in which the name of Servius did not occur. This passage of Virgil readily fulfils the condition.

(3) The argument from 'transcriptional probability' would point in the same direction. I mean that a copyist would note that Dante expressly introduces the list (see l. 89) as one of '*seven* kings,' while his enumeration does not account for that number. The simple alteration of 're' to 'tre' would make it clear at once. Hence it looks like a copyist's alteration[1]. The converse change would be less likely, since a copyist would be more alive to the fact that four and three are seven, than to the fact that historically there were not three Tarquins. I hope MS. evidence may perhaps yet be found for 're.'

(36)

In Convito IV. v. l. 123, editors have very recklessly, and without alleging any MS. authority, altered *Drusi* into *Fabii* (Giuliani) or *Curzii* (Witte) on the absurdly insufficient ground that they rendered greater or better known services to Rome, or that Dante says more about them elsewhere! But if we turn to Aen. vi. 825, 6 we find the Decii and Drusi together: also Torquatus, whom Dante has mentioned a few lines above, and Camillus, whose name occurs a little below:

> Quin Decios Drusosque procul saevumque securi
> Aspice Torquatum et referentem signa Camillum.

Other names common to the two passages are Brutus, the various kings of Rome, and Cato, and it is curious to note the sort of 'echo,' as I have called it elsewhere (see *sup.* p. 19), of the Virgilian passage, though it is not 'quoted,' and the words are differently applied. In l. 842 Virgil says:

> *Quis* te, magne Cato, *tacitum*, aut te, Cosse, relinquat?

Dante addressing Cato says, '*Chi* presumerà di te *parlare*? Certo maggiormente parlare di te non si può, che *tacere*.' I should argue, therefore, from the collocation of so many

[1] See *supra*, p. 35.

of the same names in both authors, that the *vulg. lect.* 'Drusi' in this passage of the Convito is correct, and should not be tampered with. Compare a similar argument as bearing on the reading of a proper name in Purg. xxii. 98 in my *Textual Criticism, &c.*, p. 411.

HORACE.

Every one is familiar with the selection of '*Orazio Satiro*' as one of the five great poets of antiquity in Inf. iv. 89. The writings of Dante, however, give little evidence of familiarity with his works, at any rate beyond the limits of the Ars Poetica. That is quoted four times by Dante as follows :—

(1) In Par. xxvi. 137, 8 the description of the changes in the use and fashion of words—

> Chè l' uso de' mortali è come fronda
> In ramo, che sen va ed altra viene—

is evidently copied from Ars Poetica, 60, 1 :

> Ut silvae foliis pronos mutantur in annos,
> Prima cadunt : ita verborum vetus interit aetas,

combined with ll. 70, 1 :

> Multa renascentur quae iam cecidere, cadentque
> Quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus, &c.

It is to be observed that this latter passage is definitely cited in Conv. II. xiv. l. 87 as occurring in Horace, 'nel principio della Poetria.'

(2) There is next an interesting passage in the Vita Nuova (§ 25), where Dante, wishing to justify a certain practice in poetic diction, quotes passages from precisely the four great Latin poets of the '*bella scuola*' in Inf. iv, viz. Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Lucan ; taking occasion further to notice that the quotation from the '*Poetica*' of Horace, viz. 'Dic mihi, Musa, virum' (ll. 141 *seqq.*), implies also the authority of 'il buono Omero,' so that we have the whole five here again united.

The expression *buono Omero* again is noticeable as an evident reminiscence of another passage in the Ars Poetica (l. 359), 'bonus dormitat Homerus.'

(3) Horace is again quoted as 'magister noster Horatius, . . . in principio *Poeticae*,' in De Vulg. Eloq. II. iv. l. 35, viz.:

> Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, aequam
> Viribus. (Ars Poetica, l. 38.)

(4) 'Horatius in sua *Poetica*' is twice cited (viz. ll. 93–5 and ll. 75–8) in the Epistle to Can Grande, § 10, in reference to the contrast of the styles of Tragedy and Comedy.

(5) The probability that the list of Roman poets in Purg. xxii. 97–8 has been suggested by Horace, either Epist. II. i. 58, 9 (where Terence, Caecilius, and Plautus occur together), or Ars Poetica, ll. 54, 5 (where Caecilius, Plautus, and Varius are mentioned), has been discussed in my work on *Textual Criticism, &c.*, pp. 411, 412, together with the bearing of this on the *varr. lectt.* 'Varro' and 'Vario' in Purg. xxii. 98.

(6) In De Vulg. Eloq. II. i. l. 80, there can be no doubt that 'bovem ephippiatum' is a reminiscence of Ep. I. xiv. l. 43, 'Optat ephippia bos piger.'

(7) Horace is referred to vaguely, but not quoted, together with 'Solomon and his father,' Seneca, and Juvenal, as having set forth the worthlessness of riches, in Conv. IV. xii. l. 83.

(8) The two following passages of Horace and Dante respectively should be compared.

Horace, Ars Poetica, ll. 296–8 and 301:

> Excludit sanos Helicone poetas
> Democritus, bona pars non ungues ponere curat,
> Non barbam . . .
> . . . . . .
> Si tribus Anticyris caput insanabile nunquam
> Tonsori Licino commiserit.

Conv. III. xiv. ll. 74 *seqq.*:

> Onde *Democrito*, della propria persona non curando, nè *barba*, nè *capelli*, nè *unghie* si *togliea*.

This is not exactly a quotation, but there are so many points of agreement that (especially considering the fact of

Dante's proved familiarity with the Ars Poetica) we cannot but think that there is a confused reminiscence of the lines of Horace, though the characteristics attributed by Democritus to poets are here transferred to himself. It is perhaps just worth notice that, if so, we might derive a slight argument for preferring the usual reading 'unghie *togliea*' (= ponere) to the variant *tagliea* found in one or two MSS. and supported by some editors.

(9) Finally, there is a passage in the Conv. I. ix. ll. 45 *seqq.*, 'perocchè que' [*sc.* tesori] che sono a mano dell' avaro, sono in più basso luogo, che non è la terra là ove il tesoro è nascoso,' which *may* be a reminiscence of Horace, Carm. III. iii. 49 (Aurum irrepertum et sic melius situm, Quum terra celat, &c.) —especially as this would illustrate the reference in Conv. iv. 12, mentioned under (7)—but it certainly does not amount to a quotation. Moreover, in the same passage of the Convito Dante *perhaps* may have had floating in his mind some echoes of another place in the Odes, II. ii. 1 *seqq.*:

> Nullus argento color est avaris
> Abdito terris . . .
> . . . . . nisi temperato
> Splendeat usu.

See the words just preceding those quoted above, 'Nulla cosa è utile, se non in quanto è usata; nè è la sua bontà in potenza.' But after all, these sentiments may have been arrived at independently; or the passages in question might be stock quotations in Florilegia, *s. v.* 'Avarice.' It may, I think, be confidently asserted that there is no direct evidence whatever that Dante was acquainted with the Odes of Horace.

I am not aware of any other quotations from or references to the works of Horace in Dante than those above given, and perhaps one or two somewhat conjectural ones entered in the Index. He certainly made much less use of him than of any of the other great poets in his list (Homer, of course, excepted), or even of Statius, whom in the list of best authors given in Vulg. Eloq. ii. 6, he seems to substitute for Horace. Dean

Plumptre is therefore curiously mistaken in stating (in his note to Inf. iv. 89) that 'Dante's prose works supply many quotations from Horace (Convito, *passim*).' So again Hettinger (Bowman's English Version, p. 237) makes the inaccurate observation, 'From the frequent quotations in the Convito it is evident that Dante had a special predilection for . . . the Ars Poetica of Horace.' This conclusion is true, but not the premisses from which it is drawn, for there is, as I have said, only one definite quotation from Horace (the Ars Poetica it is true) throughout the whole of the Convito.

I have already pointed out in the introductory part of this essay (p. 29) that the Odes of Horace had fallen into general oblivion and neglect in the time of Dante. I have also there shown, by quotations from some of the early commentators on Dante, that their ignorance on the subject of Horace was profound [1]. I propose now to give a summary of the evidence on which this conclusion respecting the works of Horace is based. It will be found in a recent monograph (1893) by Dr. Manitius of Göttingen, entitled 'Analekten zur Geschichte des Horaz im Mittelalter, bis 1300.' This little work is a perfect mine of curious information and patient research. The subject is so interesting in itself, and in particular in its bearing upon Dante's probable acquaintance with Horace, that I make no apology for dwelling upon it somewhat at length, and for analyzing and tabulating the curious results brought out by Dr. Manitius.

[1] It may be worth while to note some of the epithets or descriptions commonly applied to Horace by mediaeval writers. Besides 'ethicus' or 'ethnicus' (see Manitius's monograph, pp. 9, 68, 81, 83), we have 'satyricus' (*ib.* p. 66), and once 'comicus' (p. 65). St. Jerome is said to have described him as 'satyricus et lyricus,' but I have not been able to verify the passage. Conrad von Mure, who was thoroughly acquainted with Horace (especially the Odes and their metres), and who may be considered a Horatian specialist, paints his portrait in this quaint manner—'lippis oculis, Epicurus, jocosus, satiricus, Virgilii contemporaneus, doctor Ovidii' (*op. cit.* p. 105): and in the curious lines of Hugo von Trimberg (quoted later, p. 206) the following string of epithets is applied to him: 'prudens et discretus, Vitiorum emulus, firmus et mansuetus.' In all these descriptions it will be seen how 'Orazio satiro' was evidently the aspect of him that filled the eye.

These are as follows:—

	Odes.	Satires.	Epistles.	Ars Poetica.	Orazio Lirico.	Orazio Satiro [1].
To end of eighth century.	48	12	16	23	48	72(1)
Ninth and tenth centuries.						
Germany	28	13	21	9	28	43
France	16	7	14	5	16	26
Italy	11	4	11	7	11	22
Total	55	24	46	21	55	91
Eleventh century.						
Germany	48	26	27	21	48	74
France	1	—	10	1	1	34(1)
Italy	5	7	9	3	5	19
Total	54	33	46	25	54	127
Twelfth century.						
Germany (2)	24	26	75	35	24	136
France	30	39	126	75	30	240
Great Britain	21	38	54	14	21	106
Italy	2	5	19	14	2	38
Total	77	108	274	138	77	520
Thirteenth century.						
Germany (3)	8	17	29	32	8	78
France (4)	2	5	28	9	2	42
Great Britain	5	13	51	28	5	92
Italy	1	—	11	6	1	17
Total	16	35	119	75	16	229

These tables require a few explanatory notes.

(1) In these two cases twenty-one and twenty-three citations are mentioned as coming from 'Satires and Epistles together.' They could not therefore be entered under those heads separately. Hence the apparent discrepancy in the totals given in the last column.

(2) The references to Metellus of Tegernsee are not included here, since he wrote lyrics in express imitation of the Odes of Horace, of which consequently he quotes an exceptional number.

[1] 'Satiro' is used to include all the hexametral works of Horace.

(3) Omitting Conrad von Mure for a somewhat similar reason, since he made a special study of Horace throughout, and particularly of his metres. His references are extremely numerous to all parts of Horace, and chiefly, as might be expected, to the Odes.

The last two writers are Horatian *specialists*, whereas the other references are to the *general literature* of the period, and the significance of the evidence depends mainly upon this consideration.

(4) Omitting Vincent of Beauvais, because Manitius, while giving *all* his references to the Odes, expressly limits himself in the case of the Satires, Epistles, and Ars Poetica to those *which exhibit peculiar readings*: but even these are two or three times as numerous as *all* those to the Odes. It is clear that if we had the full total it would still further increase the disproportion of the above figures.

In several cases Manitius merely refers (without giving numbers) to large collections of quotations already made by Keller and Holder, and limits himself to giving only such as they have omitted.

In other cases he only says that the Epistles, &c., are quoted 'very frequently,' but gives no statistics, e.g. in the case of John of Salisbury in the twelfth century (p. 93). Such authors have had to be omitted in the above calculations, but it is evident that they would not have materially affected the conclusions, except as strengthening them further in the same direction.

Also (especially in the earlier centuries) the quotations of some writers are evidently only copied from those of Priscian and Isidore, as later no doubt many quotations are from popular Florilegia.

The following seem to me the most striking inferences to be drawn from the above statistics.

(i) While in the earliest centuries the Odes appear to have been almost, if not quite as well known as the other works, yet they fall each century more and more into the background as compared with the hexametral works, till at last, when we approach Dante's time, they almost disappear from the

literature of the period, and are evidently quite neglected, if not forgotten.

(ii) Horace seems to have been less known or read in Italy than in France or Germany. It is to be added that the number of MSS. in the former is also much less than in the latter countries: and those in France are more numerous than those in Germany (p. 6).

(iii) In the thirteenth century in particular, and especially in Italy, the study of Horace falls off in a very marked way. Indeed it is remarkable that of the seventeen citations of Horace noted above in the thirteenth-century literature of Italy, no less than eight are derived from one work alone, viz. the Sermons of Pope Innocent III, who quotes the Epistles six times and the Ars Poetica twice.

(iv) The same remark as to the growing neglect of Horace applies, though in a less striking degree, to Germany and France (less so to England, where the average is brought up by two or three writers, who are mentioned below). It is also important to note that this falling off is observable in like manner in respect of classical authors generally, as well as in the case of Horace. This is probably due, as Manitius suggests, partly to the disturbing influence of the Crusades (which of course affected the Continent more than Britain, and France and Italy more than Germany), and partly to the growth of scholasticism (pp. 109, 113). The same result, however, comes out, only in an intensified form, as to the relative position occupied by the two great divisions of the works of Horace. Thus to take a few instances from the British authors mentioned. From Wright's 'Political Songs' Manitius gives twenty-two references, of which ten are from the Epistles and twelve from the Ars Poetica; from Walter Mapes twenty-nine, of which twenty-three are from the Epistles and two each from the Odes, Satires, and Ars Poetica; from Matthew Paris fourteen, viz. Epistles eight, Ars Poetica four, and only one each from Satires and Odes; from Roger Bacon nine, viz. Satires four, Ars Poetica three, and one each from Epistles and Odes[1].

[1] There seems to me to be one unaccountable omission in the investigations of Manitius. He takes no notice of Brunetto Latini, who in his Trésor or Tesoro

The evidence of the 'Florilegia,' or collections of 'Adagia,' &c., that have come down to us is precisely to the same effect as that of the actual quotations enumerated by Manitius, &c. This, indeed, is only natural, for the practice of writers which has been analyzed above is not only 'post hoc' but 'propter hoc.' There is not the least doubt, as we have had occasion to remark elsewhere in reference to Dante[1], and as Professor

has a very large number of quotations from Horace, as also from many other authors. It is true that his quotations have an obviously secondhand character about them. In this they contrast remarkably with the large majority at any rate of those of his more distinguished pupil. Brunetto has evidently simply discharged into the pages of his work the crude contents of a commonplace book or 'Florilegium.' This copious flood of quotations is significantly limited almost entirely to what is commonly known as B. vii, the genuineness of which has sometimes been disputed. B. vi. is founded upon the Ethics of Aristotle. B. vii. makes, as it were, a fresh start upon the subject of Ethics, based, as the author admits in ch. i, on 'les Enseignemens de Moralité, por mielz descovrir les dis de Aristote.' As a matter of fact this book is a mere compendium of an early French work then widely known, entitled 'Moralité des Philosophes' (Trésor, vol. iii. p. 52, ed. Chabaille), a cento of 'dicta' or sentiments from a variety of authors, sacred and profane. Some other works of the same kind have been indicated from which contributions have been taken (*op. cit.* p. 524). In any case, whether this book be the work of Brunetto or not, it has to be taken account of, as affording evidence of the survival *somewhere* of a wider knowledge of the Odes than the statistics derived from general literature would lead us to expect. I have not been able to identify quite all the Horatian quotations. They are often so loose and inaccurate that it has been a work of considerable labour to trace them out even so far as I have done it. However, sixty-seven which I have identified are divided thus among the several works: Odes twenty-nine, Satires five, Epistles twenty-eight, Ars Poetica five.

It is perhaps curious to note the occasional mistaken attribution of quotations to Horace. Thus 'Nule chose n'est plus dure en poureté que ce que on s'en gabe' (p. 445). This is clearly Juvenal, iii. 152, 3:

> Nil habet infelix paupertas durius in se,
> Quam quod ridiculos homines facit.

Again (p. 440) 'La droite noblesse dit Oraces que ele est vertus seulement' seems certainly to represent Juvenal, viii. 20:

> Nobilitas sola est atque unica virtus.

Chabaille points out another case in which apparently a sentiment from Statius is assigned to Horace. 'Oraces dit: Nule cure n'est si griès à l'ome comme longue espérance' (p. 449 *fin.*). This seems to be for—

> Et, qua non gravior mortalibus addita cura,
> Spes, ubi longa venit. (Theb. ii. 320, 1.)

[1] Not perhaps very largely in Dante's case; see *supra*, p. 16.

Manitius points out is certainly the case with mediaeval writers generally, that their knowledge was derived largely from such 'Florilegia,' and not from the original authors (see *supra*, pp. 14 *seqq.*). Among other indications is the persistent regularity with which certain passages of Horace occur in quotation over and over again (p. 15), and in particular Epp. I. i. and ii. were very conspicuously familiar, so that there is almost a certain cycle of quotations traceable. If we remember that such collections chiefly consisted of maxims, moral sentiments, 'dicta philosophorum' and so forth, we seem to have the key at once to the predominance of the hexametral, and comparative neglect of the lyrical works of Horace, first of all in such collections[1], and next, and by consequence, in the writings and in the general knowledge of the authors of the period. It may perhaps explain the different relative position occupied by the lyrical works in the earlier centuries, that it was before the days of Florilegia[2].

The general result, I think it will be admitted, is to leave no doubt whatever as to the reason for Dante's description of Horace as 'Orazio *Satiro*,' or Horace the Moralist (compare 'Seneca morale' in Inf. iv. 141).

We have, however, a perfectly frank acknowledgement of the relative position occupied at that time by Horace's several works in an extract given by Professor Manitius from Hugo of Trimberg, a contemporary of Dante, who wrote in 1280 (see a note *supra*, under 'Homer,' p. 165), from which it appears that Horace wrote three principal books: Poetria (the form in which Dante quotes it), Sermones (i.e. as often

[1] In some of these no quotations at all occur from the Odes, and in others very few (Manitius, pp. 57, 75).

[2] The occasional occurrence of a pseudo-Horatian quotation by writers may not improbably be due to the use of a Florilegium in which some familiar saying was, as I have suggested in reference to a pseudo-Aristotelian quotation found in Dante (*supra*, p. 154), wrongly fathered. I noticed three such in Manitius. In the eleventh century, we have added to the genuine Horatian line (Ep. I. xvi. 52), 'Oderunt peccare boni virtutis amore,' the spurious pendant—'Oderunt peccare mali formidine poenae' (p. 56). Also 'Labora ne fame pereas' is attributed to Horace (p. 60). Again, a sentiment which Manitius says was a familiar one in mediaeval literature is assigned wrongly to Horace by a thirteenth-century writer—'Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum' (p. 103).

elsewhere, the Satires), and Epistolae. He adds that the Odes and Epodes are now little thought of. The following is the text of this very curious and significant statement:

> Sequitur Horatius, prudens et discretus,
> Vitiorum emulus, firmus et mansuetus;
> Qui tres libros etiam fecit principales,
> Duosque dictaverat minus usuales;
> Epodon videlicet, et librum odarum,
> Quos nostris temporibus credo valere parum.
> Hinc poetrie veteris[1] titulum ponamus,
> Sermones cum epistolis dehinc adiciamus.

These are ll. 66–73 of the *Registrum multorum auctorum*, preserved to us in one MS., and edited by Professor Huemer. I have already observed that the various epithets by which Hugo characterizes Horace all derive their propriety (like Dante's 'Satiro') from his hexametral works.

OVID.

The instances in which Dante quotes or otherwise borrows from Ovid are very numerous, though they do not reach the large total of his Virgilian references. For mythology indeed Ovid is his main authority, just as Lucan among poets comes similarly to the front in respect of his historical allusions. In the case of any variation in Dante from the ordinary forms of mythological tradition, we shall generally find that he is following the version given by Ovid.

It does not appear, however, that Dante's familiarity with Ovid extended much beyond the Metamorphoses, which he often quotes in his prose works by name, and also under the title (found in other mediaeval writers) of Ovidio Maggiore. There is no direct mention or quotation of any other work of Ovid, except one line from the very beginning of the Remedia Amoris in Vita Nuova, § 25, which is cited as an example of

[1] Prof. Huemer explains that 'veteris' is added to distinguish the 'Poetria' of Horace from 'Poetria Nova' by one Galfridus.

poetical personification or Prosopopoeia[1]. There is perhaps some reason to suppose that Dante may have been acquainted with the Heroides, but the evidence is not by any means conclusive. In his note on Par. ix. 97, Mr. Butler remarks that all the instances there given by Dante of persons who have suffered through being enslaved by Love come from the Heroides of Ovid. It is true that Phyllis the victim of Demophoon ('Sum decepta tuis et amans et femina verbis,' Her. ii. 65) is introduced by Ovid as 'Rhodopeia Phyllis,' which reminds us of 'quella Rodopeia, che delusa Fu da Demofoonte' (Par. ix. 100). But, apart from this, the instances in themselves are very obvious, viz. Aeneas and Dido, Hercules and Iole, and there is nothing sufficiently definite in Dante's notice of them to imply or to require the aid of Ovid's Heroides. The reference to Hero and Leander in Purg. xxviii. 73, 4, *may* have been suggested by Heroid. xviii. 173, 4, but again this is only conjectural. So also the story of Jason and Hypsipyle, referred to in Inf. xviii. 86 *seqq.*, *may* have been taken from Heroid vi, but we cannot speak more definitely in this case either. If it were so (as I have pointed out in *Textual Criticism, &c.*, p. 322), we might derive an interesting argument in favour of the tempting reading *senno* for *segni*, or *cenni*, in l. 91, by comparing Her. vi. 40,

Detegit ingenio vulnera facta tuo.

I cannot think that the cumulative weight of all these instances amounts to much, and if Dante had any knowledge of the Heroides, it has not left any very decided trace in his works.

It will perhaps be convenient, since mythological details form the most distinctive feature of Dante's debt to Ovid, if we deal first with passages illustrating this, and afterwards take those which bear upon reading or interpretation. Of these there is a considerable number of special interest and importance.

A group of instances is found among the warning examples introduced by Dante against the three sins expiated in the

[1] On the strength of this direct citation I have ventured to suggest in the Index a possible allusion to another passage occurring early in the same work.

first three *cornici* of Purgatory, viz. Pride, Envy, and Anger, where, without what may be called direct quotation, either the peculiar form of the story, or the special moral pointed by it, indicate its Ovidian origin.

(1)

Niobe and Arachne.

It will be remembered that Niobe and Arachne are two of the examples given by Dante of the sin of Pride in Purg xii. The resemblances which Scartazzini has pointed out, and others that might be added, leave no doubt that Dante had in his mind the tale of Niobe as related by Ovid in Metam. vi. 146 *seqq.* Besides this, the story of Arachne (who is associated by Dante with Niobe) immediately precedes that of Niobe in Ovid, Metam. vi., and moreover Ovid pointedly connects them as conveying the same warning against Pride (see ll. 150, 1),

> Nec tamen admonita est (*sc.* Niobe) poena popularis Arachnes
> Cedere coelitibus, verbisque minoribus uti.

Add further l. 169,

> utque oculos circumtulit (*sc.* Niobe) alta *superbos*;

and l. 184,

> Quaerite nunc, habeat quam nostra *superbia* causam.

Also observe that according to Ovid's version (differing from two or three other forms of the story) Niobe had seven sons and seven daughters:

> Huc natas adiice septem
> Et totidem iuvenes. (Met. vi. 182, 183.)

And again, l. 192,

> uteri pars est haec septima nostri.

So also Dante,

> Tra *sette e sette* tuoi figliuoli spenti. (l. 39.)

See further, *supra*, p. 20, for another point of interesting resemblance to Ovid in this line.

(2)

Aglauros.

Next we will instance the story of Aglauros, who is employed by Dante in the next *cornice* as one of the warnings against the sin of Envy (see Purg. xiv. 139). There are at

least three distinct forms of this myth, and there can be no doubt, I think, that Dante has in his mind that version of it which is found in Ovid, Metam. ii. 708 *seqq.*, since in that form alone is *Envy* (viz. of her sister Herse) the cause of her fate. Moreover, in Ovid it is *the prominent feature* of the story. See the fine allegorical description of the Cave of *Invidia* (l. 760 *seqq.*) visited by Minerva, and note how she calls upon her to enter into and take possession of Aglauros (l. 784),

> Infice tabe tua natarum Cecropis unam:
> Sic opus est: Aglauros ea est;

and the result is traced in l. 809,

> Felicisque bonis non secius uritur Herses,
> Quam cum spinosis ignis supponitur herbis, &c.

(3)

Procne.

Another of the warning examples selected by Dante is that of Procne, who is given in Purg. xvii. 19 as an instance of *empiezza*, i. e. ferocious and pitiless anger (comp. *empia* in Par. xvii. 64),

> Dell' empiezza di lei, che mutò forma
> Nell' uccel che a cantar più si diletta.

This of course refers to the myth of Procne and Philomela, as to which there are curious variations. According to the *Greek* tradition generally, Procne was changed into a nightingale, Philomela into a swallow. See *inter alia*, Aristotle, Rhet. III. iii. 4. But according to the *Latin* writers, and that form of the legend with which we are most familiar, Philomela was the nightingale and Procne the swallow[1]. Virgil adopts this view, as we see from Georg. iv. 15, in reference to Procne, and l. 511 in reference to Philomela. But, as far as I can see, there is nothing in Ovid's narrative (Met. vi. ll. 424–676) to show which form of the myth he followed. See ll. 668–70:

> Quarum petit altera silvas,
> Altera tecta subit: neque adhuc de pectore caedis
> Excessere notae, signataque sanguine pluma est.

[1] Some versions of the myth make Philomela instead of Procne the wife of Tereus. Not so however Ovid.

It might possibly be thought that the concluding words refer only to the last-mentioned, viz. the swallow, as in Virgil, Georg. iv. 15,

Et manibus Procne pectus signata cruentis.

But this would be a very doubtful inference, for at any rate according to Ovid the 'caedes' had been the joint work of both, see ll. 641–5.

But whatever may have been the view adopted by Ovid, Dante at any rate (whether deriving the notion from Aristotle, Rhet. *l. c.*, or elsewhere) evidently considers Procne to be the nightingale and Philomela the swallow. The latter appears from Purg. ix. 13–15:

Nell' ora che comincia i tristi lai
La rondinella presso alla mattina,
Forse a memoria de' suoi primi guai.

The 'primi guai' far more appropriately refer to the cruel outrage and sufferings of Philomela than to the wrongs of Procne. On the other hand the present passage, Purg. xvii. 19, 20,

Dell' empiezza di lei, che mutò forma
Nell' uccel che a cantar più si diletta,

clearly implies that she who was changed into a nightingale was a special example of 'empiezza.' No one can possibly read Ovid's story without noticing that this was the characteristic feature of Procne. She it was who, to revenge herself on her faithless husband, devised the horrible scheme of killing her own son Itys, and serving up his flesh to be eaten by his father, though no doubt Philomela joined her not unwillingly in the execution of it. In Ovid's story the mad fury of Procne is mentioned over and over again, e.g. Procne, furiis agitata doloris (595); Ardet, et iram Non capit ipsa suam Procne (609); Triste parat facinus, tacitaque exaestuat ira (623); infracta constitit ira (627); scelus est pietas in coniuge Tereo (635); Dissimulare nequit crudelia gaudia Procne (653), and so on. There can therefore, I think, be no doubt that, though Dante never mentions the name of Procne, she it is who here provides the typical instance 'di color cui vinse l' ira' (Inf. vii. 116).

(4)

Erysichthon.

Dante borrows from Ovid (Met. viii. 777 *seqq.*) his reference to Erysichthon in Purg. xxiii. 22–27. He likens to him when at his worst the wasted forms of the penitents in the Sixth Cornice of Purgatory who are expiating by starvation the sin of gluttony. The details and symptoms of their emaciation are taken from Ovid's description, not of Erysichthon himself, but of the personification of 'Fames' occurring in the same narrative. Compare ll. 801–4,

> Hirtus erat crinis, cava lumina, pallor in ore:
> . . . . . .
> Dura cutis, per quam spectari viscera possent:
> Ossa sub incurvis exstabant arida lumbis;

with Purg. xxiii. 22–7:

> Negli occhi era ciascuna oscura e cava,
> Pallida nella faccia, e tanto scema,
> Che dall' ossa la pelle s' informava.
> Non credo che così a buccia estrema
> Eresitone fosse fatto secco
> Per digiunar, quando più n' ebbe tema.

The allusion in the last two lines is explained by Ovid, ll. 875–8:

> Vis tamen illa mali postquam consumpserat omnem
> Materiam, dederatque gravi nova pabula morbo;
> Ipse suos artus lacero divellere morsu
> Coepit, et infelix minuendo corpus alebat.

So again in the next canto, l. 28,

> Vidi per fame a vôto usar li denti,

is suggested by Ovid, ll. 824, 5:

> Petit ille dapes sub imagine somni,
> Oraque vana movet, dentemque in dente fatigat.

It may also be added that the idea of adding to their punishment by the presence of incentives to appetite which were out of their reach is another conspicuous feature in the Ovidian narrative.

(5)

Polydorus and Polymestor.

The story of the murder of Polydorus by Polymestor referred to thus by Dante (Purg. xx. 115),

Polinestor ch' ancise Polidoro,

might have been derived either from Virgil, Aen. iii. 49 *seqq.*, or from Ovid, Met. xiii. 429–438, but at any rate the name of Polymestor occurs in Ovid only, and not in Virgil[1]. Further, we know this passage of Ovid to have been familiar to Dante from Inf. xxx. 16 *seqq.*

(6)

Athamas.

The story of Athamas in Inf. xxx. 4–12 has quite evidently been written by Dante with Ovid, Met. iv. 511–529, before his eyes. The points of resemblance are numerous and unmistakable.

Protinus Aeolides media furibundus in aula
Clamat, Io, comites, his retia tendite silvis!
Hic modo cum gemina visa est mihi prole leaena.
(ll. 512–514.)

Compare

Atamante divenne tanto insano,
Che veggendo la moglie con due figli
Andar carcata da ciascuna mano,
Gridò: 'Tendiam le reti, sì ch' io pigli
La leonessa e i leoncini al varco.' (ll. 4–8.)

Then again the murder of Learchus—

Parva Learchum
Brachia tendentem rapit, et bis terque per auras
More rotat fundae, rigidoque infantia saxo
Discutit ossa ferox. (ll. 515–518.)

Compare

E rotollo, e percosselo ad un sasso. (l. 11.)

Finally, the drowning of Ino with her other son Melicerta:

E quella s' annegò con l' altro carco. (l. 12.)

This in Ovid takes five or six lines to describe, ending thus:

Seque super pontum, nullo tardata timore,
Mittit, *onusque suum*. (ll. 524–529.)

[1] It is however in the notes of Servius. (See *supra*, pp. 189–91.)

Dr. Carlyle remarks that it is interesting to note both the brevity of Dante as compared with Ovid, and also 'the fresh touches by which he shows the very heart of the story here and elsewhere.' The former point has been already noticed in comparison with Virgil (*supra*, p. 182).

(7)

The Hermaphrodite.

The celebrated transformation scene in Inf. xxv. has many striking points of resemblance with the passage in 'Ovidio Maggiore' describing the formation of the Hermaphrodite. Besides the perhaps obvious simile of the ivy in Inf. xxv. 58, and Met. iv. 365, we may specially note the following resemblances:—

Vedi che già non sei nè due nè uno (l. 69),

and

Due e nessun l' imagine perversa
Parea. (l. 77.)

Compare

Nec duo sunt et forma duplex, nec femina dici
Nec puer ut possint; neutrumque et utrumque videntur.
(ll. 378, 379.)

And again,

Quando n' apparver due figure miste
In una faccia, ov' eran due perduti. (ll. 71, 72.)

Compare

Nam mista duorum
Corpora iunguntur, faciesque inducitur illis
Una. (ll. 373, 374.)

(8)

Nessus.

It is interesting sometimes to trace the source of Dante's ideas respecting mythological persons or incidents through small resemblances in detail, though there may be nothing amounting to direct quotation. The cumulative force of several such resemblances close together may amount to convincing proof. Dante's treatment of Nessus in Inf. xii. may be taken as an example. The several points of correspondence with Ovid, Met. ix. ll. 101 *seqq.*, leave little doubt that Dante

had this passage in his mind, and probably before his eyes. We may notice first, though without laying much stress upon it by itself, the expression 'Nesse *ferox*' at the beginning of Ovid's episode, corresponding with Dante's introduction of him as threatening Virgil and Dante, and the comment thereon:

> Mal fu la voglia tua sempre sì tosta. (l. 66.)

Next he is described as

> Nesso,
> Che morì per la bella Deianira,
> E fe' di sè la vendetta egli stesso (ll. 67–69),

referring of course to his dying gift to Dejanira of the fatal shirt which caused the death of Hercules, by whom he was himself slain. Compare with this—

> At te, Nesse ferox, eiusdem virginis ardor
> Perdiderat, &c. (ll. 101 *seqq.*)

and

> Excipit hunc Nessus: neque enim moriemur inulti,
> Secum ait; et calido velamina tincta cruore
> Dat munus raptae, velut irritamen amoris. (ll. 131–133.)

In Ovid's account, as here, there is the difficulty of crossing the river ('impervius amnis,' l. 106). Nessus is described as 'membrisque valens scitusque vadorum' (l. 108). We observe that Virgil asks for a guide who can point out the ford over the river of blood (l. 94). Nessus is appointed for the purpose, and leads them to a shallow place where the river reaches only to the feet, and there they passed over (ll. 125–6). Nessus explains the varying depths of the stream in different parts (ll. 127–132), and finally leaves them on the other side, repassing the ford (*il guazzo*) himself (l. 139). Here we have ample reference to the 'scitus vadorum,' and that being so, it is perhaps not altogether fanciful to suppose that we have an echo of 'membris valens' in the other part of the commission given to Nessus, viz. that he should protect Virgil and Dante against all attacks:

> E fa cansar, s' altra schiera v' intoppa. (l. 99.)

Further, not only does Nessus point out the fords, but he

performs the same office for Dante that he does for Dejanira in Ovid, by carrying him across on his back:

E che porti costui in su la groppa (l. 95).

See Met. ix. 109:

Officioque meo ripa sistetur in illa
Haec, ait, Alcide.

We have thus a great many of the details of the scene in Ovid reproduced by Dante.

(9)

Phalaris and Perillus.

I have suggested (in the Index) with some hesitation the possibility of Dante having derived the story of Phalaris and Perillus in Inf. xxvii. 7 *seqq.* from Ovid, Ars Amat. i. 652–6. I have no other evidence of Dante's acquaintance with that work, and he would not perhaps have found it a congenial study, but it would be just such a passage as would, from its excellent moral, be likely to appear in a Florilegium or book of extracts, which Dante may not improbably have employed for the minor works of Ovid. Compare Dante's reflection 'e ciò fu dritto' with that of Ovid:

Iustus uterque[1] fuit: neque enim lex aequior ulla,
Quam necis artifices arte perire sua.

Moreover this very passage is quoted in illustration here by Pietro di Dante. Still this is but a conjecture, especially as we have another possible source ready to hand in Orosius, Adv. Pag. I. xx. §§ 1–4. The purpose of Orosius is to contrast the cruelty of those and other Pagan times with the milder rule which Christian influences have induced even Roman emperors to practise[2].

(10)

Antaeus, Semiramis, &c.

Dante expressly refers to Ovid and Lucan as his authorities for the story of Antaeus in De Mon. II. 8; and in the following chapter to Ovid and Orosius for that of Ninus and

[1] *Uterque* refers to Busiris and Phalaris, both of whom Ovid has just mentioned.

[2] See further *infra*, under Valerius Maximus.

Semiramis, but in each case his indebtedness to Ovid is much less than to the other author with whom he is coupled, so that we need not notice these instances further here.

(11)

Typhoeus.

We note next the curiously rationalistic treatment of the myth of Typhoeus in Par. viii. 70, where Dante says that the volcanic phenomena of Sicily are due to the presence of sulphur and not to the struggles of the buried Typhoeus. It only concerns us to observe that Dante here follows Ovid and not Virgil, they giving different traditions as to these phenomena. Ovid, in Met. v. 346 *seqq.*, attributes them to Typhoeus, but Virgil, in Aen. iii. 578 *seqq.*, to Enceladus. Mr. Butler, referring to the latter passage only, wrongly ascribes an error to Dante here.

(12)

Ulysses and Circe.

I am inclined to think that Dante probably derived his tradition of Ulysses and Circe from Ovid, Met. xiv.[1] Of course it was a well-known story, but it struck me as curious that Dante should make Ulysses say in Inf. xxvi. 91–2 that he was detained by Circe for more than one year:

Circe, che sottrasse
Me più d' un anno;

and wondering whence (Homer being excluded) he may have found this, I referred to possible sources, and met with a similar statement in Ovid, Met. xiv. 308:

Annua nos illic *tenuit* mora.

This does not exclude his knowledge of Virgil's brief reference to the same story at the beginning of Aen. vii., and in particular the next line (l. 93) seems distinctly derived from that passage in Virgil, though the burial of Caieta is also referred to a little later in the same context in Ovid[2].

[1] On the possible sources of the general Ulysses legend adopted by Dante, see further under Cicero, No. 10.

[2] For (12 *a*) see Supplementary Note, *infra*.

(13)

Dreams at Daybreak.

Dante was familiar with the common belief of the ancients that true dreams are those which occur in the morning hours. He refers to it in Inf. xxvi. 7:

> Ma se presso al mattin del ver si sogna;

and again in Purg. ix. 16–18, where he also suggests some sort of explanation for it:

> Che la mente nostra peregrina
> Più dalla carne, e men da' pensier presa,
> Alle sue vision quasi è divina.

He gives, so to speak, practical effect to this belief by describing three significant visions as occurring to himself in the early dawn of each of the three mornings spent in Purgatory, viz. ix. 19 *seqq.*; xix. 1–34; xxvii. 94–108.

The line quoted above from the Inferno is not a direct quotation from anywhere, but the classical passage most likely to have been familiar to Dante (unless this is a commonplace which Florilegia might supply) is that quoted by Scartazzini from Ovid, Heroid. xix. 195, 6:

> Namque sub Auroram, iam dormitante lucerna,
> Somnia quo cerni tempore vera solent.

(14)

The Golden Age.

Ovid's beautiful description of the golden age (Met. i. 89–112) was evidently very familiar to Dante:

> Aurea prima sata est aetas, ...
> . . . . . per se dabat omnia tellus;
> Contentique cibis nullo cogente creatis,
> Arbuteos fetus montanaque fraga legebant,
> . . . . . .
> Et quae deciderant patula Iovis arbore, glandes.
> Ver erat aeternum, placidique tepentibus auris
> Mulcebant Zephyri natos sine semine flores.
> Mox etiam fruges tellus inarata ferebat:
> . . . . . .
> Flumina iam lactis, iam flumina nectaris ibant.

Then compare Dante:

Lo secol primo quant' oro fu bello;
Fe' saporose con fame le ghiande,
E nettare con sete ogni ruscello. (Purg. xxii. 148–150.)

Quelli che anticamente poetaro
L' età dell' oro e suo stato felice,
Forse in Parnaso esto loco sognaro.
Qui[1] fu innocente l' umana radice;
Qui primavera è sempre, ed ogni frutto;
Nettare è questo di che ciascun dice.
(Purg. xxviii. 139–144.)

Dante having thus identified the Earthly Paradise with the Golden Age of the poets, we may further compare the following with the above passage of Ovid:

Traendo più color con le sue mani,
Che l' alta terra senza seme gitta; (ll. 68, 69.)

and

Vedi l' erbetta, i fiori e gli arbuscelli,
Che qui la terra sol da sè produce.
(Purg. xxvii. ll. 134, 135.)

We turn now to passages in Dante where light is thrown upon the *reading* by quotations from Ovid.

(15)

The first of these (which has already been referred to, *sup.* p. 38) is a typical instance of the need of precaution in correcting the text of an author by the help of his quotations. In Purg. xxxiii. 43 *seqq.* we have the celebrated *crux* of Beatrice's prophecy of 'un cinquecento diece e cinque,' known sometimes as the DVX, and she fears that her 'dark saying' ('narrazion buia, Qual Temi e Sfinge') will be scarcely intelligible, but promises a speedy solution of the riddle in these terms:

Ma tosto fien li fatti *le Naiade*,
Che solveranno questo enigma forte,
Senza *danno di pecore o di biade.* (ll. 49–51.)

The question naturally arises, What conceivable connexion have the Naiads with the solution of riddles? We turn to

[1] i. e. in the Earthly Paradise.

Ovid, Met. vii. 759 *seqq.*, which is evidently in Dante's mind, and we read:

> Carmina *Laiades* non intellecta priorum
> Solverat ingeniis . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> Scilicet alma *Themis* non talia linquit inulta.
> Protinus Aoniis immittitur altera Thebis
> Pestis, *et exitio multi pecorumque suoque*
> Rurigenae pavere feram.

The imitation is obvious in several points. What more simple (we might at first sight imagine) than to infer that somehow *Laiade* has been corrupted into *Naiade*? But the fact is that in Dante's time the text ran:

> Carmina Naiades non intellecta priorum
> Solvunt ingeniis[1],

the true reading being a more recent, though certain, correction, supplied by MSS. since brought to light. This is a warning that we must be careful to avoid 'anachronisms' in the text which we employ for the correction of quotations.

It is interesting to note how blindly Dante followed Ovid in his mythology, even accepting the anomaly of associating the Naiads with the Sphinx and the solution of riddles, simply because such appeared to be the case in this one passage.

(16)

The same warning as to possible changes in the text of an author quoted by Dante is enforced by a remarkable passage in Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 173 *seqq.*, where the translation by Dante of a long passage of five consecutive lines from Met. vii. 507–11 conversely throws light on some disputed readings in Ovid, or rather indicates to us clearly certain variants in the text of Ovid followed by Dante as compared with our present text.

The ordinary modern text of Ovid reads thus:

> Nec *dubie* vires, quas haec (*al.* nunc) habet insula, vestras
> *Ducite*, et omnis *eat* rerum status ille mearum.
> Robora non desunt; superat mihi miles et *hosti*.
> Gratia Dis; felix et inexcusabile tempus. (ll. 508–511.)

[1] Burmann here notes, 'Ita veteres omnes libri.'

Dante translates: 'non *dite* a voi *dubbiose* le forze che ha questa isola, e *tutto questo è stato delle mie cose*: forze non ci menomano, anzi ne sono a noi di soperchio, e *lo avversario è grande*; e il tempo da dare è bene avventuroso, e senza scusa,' &c. From this it looks as if Dante read (1) *dubias*; some editions have *dubiae*, and Burmann proposes, with some MS. authority, to read *dubias*, for the usual *dubie*. (2) *Dicite*[1], which has more MS. authority, *auct.* Burmann, than *Ducite*, though he prefers the latter. (3) *erat* for *eat*, especially since most MSS. (including my own) have *è* before *stato*, though it is omitted in some editions (e.g. Giuliani). Also *erat* was the older and commoner reading, and that of most MSS. of Ovid, and so doubtless occurred in the text used by Dante. At any rate Dante's translation, though not very clear, seems to have more relation to *erat* than *eat*. (4) He seems certainly, from his rather paraphrastic rendering, to have read *hostis* and not *hosti*, and this also seems to have been the reading of the majority of MSS. and earlier editions. (5) Finally, it appears as if in the following line he must have read '*Est grandis*,' or some such words, instead of '*Gratia Dis*,' but I cannot find any trace of such a reading recorded; nor is there anything to explain the introduction of the words 'da dare' which appear to be in all MSS., and are probably a gloss added by Dante to bring out more clearly the meaning of the sentence, which is somewhat abrupt without it.

It is evident then that, as we should expect, the text used by Dante corresponds with the old *lect. vulg.* in its uncorrected state, and here and elsewhere it is to this which we must have recourse when dealing in any way with his translations or quotations.

(17)

In Conv. IV. xv. ll. 76 *seqq.* we have a long and almost verbatim quotation of no less than six lines of Ovid occurring in Met. i. 78–83. We are thus enabled with confidence to

[1] Compare another case of the interchange of *duco* and *dico* under Cicero, No. 20.

restore the true reading in the only place in which the quotation does not follow the original, especially as the substituted words, even apart from this, plainly declare themselves to be an intrusive gloss. In the third and fourth lines of the quotation the words 'recens tellus seductaque nuper ab alto Aethere' are represented in all MSS. (it is said) thus: 'la recente terra di poco dipartita dal nobile *corpo sottile e diafano.* It is quite obvious (as the Edd. Mil. have pointed out) that these words were a marginal gloss intended to explain the strange word 'Etera,' and that they have supplanted it in the text. This is a case then in which we need not hesitate on the strength of the quotation to replace the word *etera* in the text, as most editors have done (see *supra*, p. 36, and also under Vulgate, No. 12).

Another curious point here is that Dante quotes Ovid's words, 'Natus est homo' ('non disse *gli uomini*'), as a confirmation of the scriptural doctrine of the origin of mankind from a single ancestor[1] (Conv. *l. c.* l. 76).

(18)

Purg. i. 9. E qui Calliope alquanto surga.

The ordinary reading *surga* in this invocation to Calliope is protected against the gratuitous and tasteless conjecture *turga* (included to avoid the repetition of nearly the same word in the rhymes) by Ovid, Met. v. 338:

> Surgit, et immissos hedera collecta capillos
> Calliope querulas praetentat pollice chordas.

It may be observed that the fable of the 'Piche' (see l. 11) is the subject of the context in which these lines occur in Ovid.

(19)

Purg. xxv. 130, 131. Al bosco
Si tenne Diana.

The imitation of Ovid here bears upon the reading, which is disputed, and clearly supports 'si *tenne*' against 'si *corse*.' The incident, like so many others of Dante's examples of Virtues and Vices in the Purgatorio, has been apparently suggested

[1] On this practice of Dante see *supra*, p. 27.

by Ovid. See Met. ii. 453 *seqq.*, and especially l. 455, Nacta nemus gelidum ; and ll. 464–5 :

I procul hinc, dixit, nec sacros pollue fontes,
Cynthia, deque suo iussit secedere coetu.

From this it is clear that Helice was driven out of the wood and Diana remained there (see further Scartazzini's note, *h. l.*).

(20)

Inf. i. 48. Sì che parea che l' aer ne temesse.

It is not impossible that the expression in Ovid, Met. xiii. 406, 'latratu *terruit* auras,' may have suggested this use of *temesse*, and it might in that case be held to support the reading *temesse* against *tremesse*, especially as we know from Inf. xxx. 16–21 that this passage in the Metamorphoses was familiar to Dante.

(21)

In Inf. xxiv. 110 we have the two readings

D' incenso lagrime ed amomo

and

. . . . . e d' amomo.

This is a point of distinction in which the MSS. are of no help to us, but the former reading is certainly made more probable by a comparison with Ovid, Met. xv. 394,

Sed turis lacrimis et succo vivit amomi,

where *lacrimis* belongs to *turis* only, to which, as Scartazzini observes (note *h. l.*), it could only properly apply. The whole passage shows other features of resemblance with Ovid *l. c.* *Inter alia* it is observable that in l. 108,

Quando al cinquecentesimo anno appressa,

Dante follows Ovid, l. 395 :

Haec ubi quinque suae complevit saecula vitae.

It may be noted that Brunetto Latini (Tesoro, v. 26) says that it is a matter of dispute whether the resurrection of the Phoenix takes place after 540 years, or 500 ('come li più dicono'), or even 1,000 years.

(22)

In Inf. xviii. 91, where it is usual to read

Ivi con *segni* e con parole ornate,

there is, I think, much to be said for the reading *senno* (which has very respectable MS. support), on the strength of the probable recollection of Ovid, Her. vi. 40:

Detegit *ingenio* vulnera facta tuo.

I need not repeat here what I have already said upon this point in *Textual Criticism*, pp. 321, 322. I reluctantly refrained from actually introducing *senno* in the text of the Oxford Dante, yielding to the opinion of some to whose judgement I felt bound to attach great weight.

We will next take some references throwing light on the *interpretation* of passages in the Divina Commedia.

(23)

The meaning of the much disputed expression in Purg. xxviii. 50, 51,

Proserpina . . . . perdette . . . . primavera,

seems, I think, settled for us by a comparison of the passage in Ovid, Met. v. 385–401, as has been sufficiently explained, *supra*, p. 43.

We may also compare the use of *mai*, apparently for the flowers of May, a few lines earlier, in Purg. xxviii. 36; just as we use the word 'may' for the flowering thorn, and as indeed *primavera* is itself used in Italian for the *primrose* in particular (comp. Vita Nuova, § 24).

It has been suggested (e.g. Beccaria, *Di alcuni Luoghi, &c.*, p. 172) that the meaning is that Proserpine passed from the springtime and gaiety of girlhood to the mature summer and serious life of matronhood, an explanation that has not much to recommend it.

(24)

Dante twice refers to the fable of Argus (Purg. xxix. 95, 6; xxxii. 64–6), deriving his information no doubt from Ovid, Met. i. 568 *seqq*. In the former of these passages Dante uses

an expression, the explanation of which is, I think, given by a passage in Ovid, *l. c.* Dante compares the eyes of the 'four Beasts' of the Apocalyptic vision to those of Argus, 'Se fosser vivi[1].' This certainly does not merely mean 'if they were (now) living,' as sometimes translated, but 'supposing they were alive,' i.e. watchful, and the reason for this at first sight scarcely necessary proviso seems to be supplied by two passages in Ovid. First we learn that the eyes of Argus took rest in pairs, so that they would not be all *vivi* together at any time. Then finally under the incantations of Mercury they were all closed together, and so all ceased to be 'vivi.' The two passages are

> Centum luminibus cinctum caput Argus habebat:
> *Inde suis vicibus capiebant bina quietem;*
> Cetera servabant, atque in statione manebant; (ll. 625–627)

and then, in the crisis of his fate,

> Vidit Cyllenius omnes
> Succubuisse oculos, adopertaque lumina somno. (ll. 713, 714.)

In contrast with either or both of these passages the eyes of the 'four Beasts' are always *vivi.* 'They rest not day nor night.'

(25)

Purg. ix. 5, 6. Poste in figura del freddo animale
Che con la coda percote la gente.

The probable imitation here of Ovid, Met. xv. 371[2],

> Scorpius exibit, caudaque minabitur unca—

with which we may compare (though less likely to be known to Dante) Fasti iv. 163:

> Elatae metuendus acumine caudae
> Scorpius—

appears to me to be a strong argument (among others) for the usual interpretation of the 'freddo animale' as being the

[1] We might further illustrate this use of *vivi* as applied to the keen vision of eyes by Inf. xxiv. 70:

> 'Ma gli occhi vivi
> Non potean ire al fondo per l'oscuro.'

[2] A context familiar to Dante, see Index.

scorpion. This, however, is disputed by Scartazzini and other modern commentators. On this see further my *Time References in the Divina Commedia*, pp. 80 *seqq.*

(26)

The interpretation of the variously explained phrase, 'fuor di tutto suo costume,' in Purg. xxviii. 66, seems to be determined (as Scartazzini has pointed out) by the word *inscius* in the passage from Ovid, Met. x. 525, 6:

> Namque pharetratus dum dat puer oscula matri,
> *Inscius* exstanti destrinxit arundine pectus.

The *unintentional* wound is the unusual (*fuor di costume*) act attributed to Cupid.

A few passages may now be added which do not fall under any of the above heads.

(27)

Purg. iv. 138, 9. E dalla riva
Copre la notte già col piè Morrocco.

The old commentator, Daniello da Lucca, here quotes in illustration, Ovid, Met. ii. 142, 3:

> Dum loquor, Hesperio positas in littore metas
> Humida nox tetigit.

It is not at all improbable that this may have been in Dante's mind, for the story of Phaeton, in which these words occur, was very familiar to him, being referred to five times in the Divina Commedia (once in this Canto); also in the Convito (ii. 15); and in one of the Epistles (viii. 4). It is curious that the time of day—dawn in Ovid, noon in Dante—is described by the position of the edge of night in both cases, and in somewhat similar language. In the passage of Dante there is first a difference of reading—*e dalla riva*, and *ed alla riva*. These readings would be indistinguishable in most MSS. Next, the word *riva* is differently explained. (1) It is taken to mean 'the river's bank,' i.e. the Ganges, since when the sun is setting at Gades or Morocco, it would be (according to mediaeval geography) midnight at Jerusalem, and the point of sunrise at the Ganges: so that 'from the river's bank to

Morocco' would delineate the hemisphere of night, and Morocco would be just touched by the advancing foot of night. The interpretation does not run quite smoothly, since 'dalla riva' scarcely applies to the precise fact described in l. 139. (2) 'Riva' is explained as the brink of the ocean, or the boundary of the world on the West. In that case, it would correspond with 'Hesperio positas in littore metas' in the passage of Ovid. This, though perhaps better suiting the reading *ed alla riva*, is not inconsistent with *e dalla riva*, as it might be contended that Dante regarded the night as coming up out of the West, where lay 'the great sea of darkness,' just as day comes forth from the East. We might illustrate this idea by the expression '*πρὸς ζόφον*' in Homer='to the West.' Also by Par. xii. 46–51, where Dante describes the West wind as coming forth from Spain, and the ocean wherein the sun sinks to rest, to renew the face of Europe. (See p. 227.)

(28)

There are two places where the various and changing colours of the dawn are described by Dante, which, if not copied from Ovid, are at least in very striking correspondence with him.

Compare Purg. xxx. 22, 3:

> Io vidi già nel cominciar del giorno
> La parte oriental tutta rosata,

with Met. ii. 112–4:

> Rutilo patefecit ab ortu
> Purpureas Aurora fores, et plena rosarum
> Atria.

It should be noticed that in the previous Canto, Purg. xxix, Dante distinctly shows familiarity with the episode in the Metamorphoses in which these lines occur.

Also the still more striking resemblance should be noticed between Purg. ii. 7–9:

> Sì che le bianche e le vermiglie guance,
> Là dove io era, della bella Aurora,
> Per troppa etate divenivan rance;

and Met. vi. 47–9:

> Ut solet aer
> Purpureus fieri, cum primum Aurora movetur,
> Et breve post tempus candescere solis ab ortu.

Thus Dante traces three stages: (1) white, i.e. a cold and colourless gleaming; (2) red or crimson; (3) orange. Ovid (1) red or crimson before sunrise, (2) and after sunrise a glowing whiteness, or rather brightness. In Dante they are all apparently before the actual rising of the sun, so that there is no inconsistency in the two descriptions.

(29)

I am inclined to think that the following is a case similar to the preceding. In Par. xii. 46 *seqq.* Dante thus describes the west coast of Spain, the birthplace of St. Dominic:

In quella parte ove surge ad aprire
Zeffiro dolce le novelle fronde,
Di che si vede Europa rivestire,
Non molto lungi al percoter dell' onde,
Dietro alle quali, per la lunga foga,
Lo sol tal volta ad ogni uom si nasconde.

Compare with this Met. i. 63, 4:

Vesper et occiduo quae littora sole tepescunt,
Proxima sunt Zephyro.

(30)

Another probable imitation of the same kind is the following:

Di quel color che per lo sole avverso
Nube dipinge da sera e da mane (Par. xxvii. 28, 29),

compared with:

Qui color infectis adversi solis ab ictu
Nubibus esse solet, aut purpureae Aurorae. (Met. iii. 183, 184.)

These resemblances can scarcely be accidental, especially when we observe that this Book of the Metamorphoses was evidently familiar to Dante.

(31)

There is an interesting instance of an imperfectly remembered quotation pointed out by Mr. Butler in Par. ii. 18. Dante speaks of the wonder of the companions of Jason when they saw their leader turn ploughman:

Quei gloriosi che passaro a Colco,
Non s' ammiraron, come voi farete,
Quando Jason vider fatto bifolco.

But Ovid, Met. vii. 118–121, attributes this astonishment to the natives:

> Suppositoque iugo pondus grave cogit aratri
> Ducere, et insuetum ferro proscindere campum.
> *Mirantur Colchi*: Minyae clamoribus augent
> Adiiciuntque animos.

LUCAN.

Lucan was a poet widely known and very often quoted by mediaeval writers generally; Dante in particular not only refers to him frequently by name, but is indebted to him for many of his historical allusions[1], as well as for a considerable amount of poetic material of different kinds, as the references here collected will show.

The historical allusions, being the most characteristic feature of Dante's debt to Lucan, may be conveniently taken first.

(1)

The allusion to Curio in Inf. xxviii. 97–102, and especially his *dictum*, l. 98—

> Affermando che il fornito
> Sempre con danno l' attender sofferse—

is borrowed from Lucan, Phars. i. 281,

> Semper nocuit differre paratis[2].

[1] In connexion with this we may quote the opinion of Lucan expressed by Boccaccio, Comento, i. p. 333, that his style was 'piuttosto *storiografo metrico* che poetico.' It is curious to find G. Villani in his Cronica, viii. 36, mentioning Lucan together with Virgil among his authorities for early Roman history: 'Leggendo le storie e' gran fatti de' Romani scritti per Virgilio, e per Sallustio, e Lucano, e Tito Livio, e Valerio, e Paolo Orosio, e altri maestri d' istorie.' After all, the early history is no more critical in the prose authors than the poets, so that Dante and his contemporaries 'avaient raison' in thus using the poets. (See further Supplementary Notes, *infra*).

[2] Prof. Manitius in an article in *Philologus* notes the specially frequent recurrence (probably due to their selection in *Florilegia*) of two passages from Lucan in mediaeval literature. One of them is the line quoted above. The other is i. 92:

> Nulla fides regni sociis, omnisque potestas
> Impatiens consortis erit.

I do not find that this is ever referred to by Dante.

(This is further proved, if necessary, by Dante's direct citation of this passage in reference to Curio in his Epistle to Henry VII, Epist. vii. § 4.) Among minor points of resemblance, compare *scacciato* in l. 97 with Phars. i. l. 278,

> Pellimur e patriis laribus, patimurque volentes
> Exsilium:

and observe how Inf. xxviii. ll. 101, 2—

> Con la lingua tagliata nella strozza,
> Curio, ch' a dire fu così *ardito*,

is illustrated by line 269 in Lucan,

> *Audax* venali comitatur *Curio lingua*;

this 'audacia' being emphasized by his boldness for good once—

> Vox quondam populi, libertatemque tueri
> *Ausus*. (ll. 270, 271.)

(2)

The incident of the interview of Caesar and Amyclas in Par. xi. 67–9,

> Nè valse udir che la trovò sicura
> Con Amiclate, al suon della sua voce,
> Colui ch' a tutto il mondo fe' paura—

is clearly suggested by Phars. v. 504 *seqq.*, a passage definitely cited and translated by Dante in Conv. IV. xiii. ll. 112 *seqq.* Compare especially with the above,

> O vitae tuta facultas
> Pauperis, angustique lares! . . .
> . . . . quibus hoc contingere templis
> Aut potuit muris, nullo trepidare tumultu
> Caesarea pulsante manu? (ll. 527–531.)

(3)

In Par. ix. ll. 82 *seqq.*, Folco of Marseilles is made to give a curiously roundabout description of his place of habitation. The great *valle* of the Mediterranean is first described as extending (according to the mistaken geographical ideas of the time) for 90° of longitude from Jerusalem westwards. Then Folco says that he dwelt on its shore between (i. e. about mid-way between) the Ebro and the Macra (the latter being a small river forming the north-west boundary of Tuscany). Finally,

that his home was nearly on the same parallel of longitude as Buggea (Bougie) in Africa: and as if this were not enough, he adds yet another mark of identification, that it was the place

Che fe' del sangue suo già caldo il porto. (l. 93.)

This very allusive description of Marseilles is interesting, because it assumes our familiarity (as has been noticed before in the case of the Vulgate, Aristotle, Virgil, and Ovid [1]) with the passage of Lucan by which it is suggested, viz. his lengthy description of the defeat of the Massilians by D. Brutus, B.C. 49, in Phars. iii. 537 *seqq.* See especially ll. 572, 3:

Cruor altus in undis
Spumat, et obducto concrescunt sanguine fluctus;

and again, l. 577:

Hauseruntque suo permixtum sanguine pontum.

It is curious how Lucan dwells on this feature, as appears again in the following tasteless exaggeration:

Et quodcumque cadit frustrato pondere ferrum,
Exceptum mediis invenit vulnus in undis. (ll. 581, 582.)

(4)

In connexion with this we may note the other reference to Marseilles in the Divina Commedia, which is also derived from the same context in Lucan. In the fourth *cornice* of Purgatory, Caesar is one of the examples given of strenuous activity in correction of the sin of Accidia:

Cesare, per soggiogare Ilerda,
Punse Marsilia, e poi corse in Ispagna.
(Purg. xviii. 101, 102.)

In other words, he himself hurried on to Spain, leaving Brutus to complete the conquest of Marseilles. Cf. Phars. iii. 453–5:

Dux tamen, impatiens haesuri ad moenia Martis,
Versus ad Hispanas acies extremaque mundi
Iussit bella geri.

And see further the beginning of Pharsalia, Bk. iv, where the description of Ilerda and its siege by Caesar occurs.

[1] Add also Statius, see *infra*, p. 247.

(5)

There is a difficult expression in Purg. vi. 125, which has its most probable explanation in another allusive reference to Lucan:

Ed un Marcel diventa
Ogni villan che parteggiando viene.

The interpretation of this is much disputed, but considering that Dante is denouncing opponents of the Emperor ('Cesare mio,' l. 114 *seqq.*), it seems most natural to suppose the reference to be to the 'Marcellus loquax' of Lucan, Phars. i. 313, where Caesar mentions him, together with Cato and Pompey, as among his bitterest foes.

(6)

From Lucan also comes the description in Purg. ix. 136 *seqq.* of the grating of the hinges of the doors of the Roman treasury when guarded against Caesar, though in vain, by Metellus. To this the sound of the opening gates of Purgatory is likened. It is implied no doubt in both cases that the need for opening is infrequent. See Phars. iii. 153 *seqq.*:

Protinus abducto patuerunt templa Metello.
Tunc rupes Tarpeia sonat, magnoque reclusas
Testatur sridore fores . . .

and ll. 167, 8:

Tristi spoliantur templa rapina;
Pauperiorque fuit tunc primum Caesare Roma.

Compare with the last two lines:

Come tolto le fu il buono
Metello, per che poi rimase macra. (Purg. ix. 137, 138.)

(7)

Though the precise office assigned to Cato by Dante in Purgatory seems to have been directly suggested to him by a passage in Virgil[1], yet most of his language respecting Cato, as well as the particular estimate formed of his character,

[1] See *supra*, under Virgil, No. 4, where something more is said respecting Dante's treatment of Cato.

appears to be derived chiefly from Lucan. See Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 32 *seqq.*: 'Onde si legge di Catone, che non a sè, ma alla patria e a tutto il mondo nato essere credea.' This evidently refers to Phar. ii. 383,

Nec sibi, sed toti genitum se credere mundo.

So in Conv. IV. xxviii. ll. 97 *seqq.*, Dante paraphrases and expounds allegorically a passage in Phars. ii. 338–345, in which Marcia apostrophizes Cato. Dante justifies his exposition, in which Marcia symbolizes the human soul, and Cato represents God, by asking—'E quale uomo terreno più degno fu di significare Iddio, che Catone? Certo nullo.' The same passage of Lucan seems to have suggested Purg. i. 79 *seqq.*, where Dante says of Marcia,

Che in vista ancor ti prega,
O santo petto, che per tua la tegni;

and the precise expression 'santo petto,' or, as we read in Conv. IV. v. l. 140, 'O sacratissimo petto di Catone,' may be compared with another place in Lucan, viz. Phars. ix. 555, where 'sancto Catoni' occurs, and also l. 561, where the exact expression 'tua pectora sacra' is used.

(8)

It is most likely that Dante's reference to Xerxes in Purg. xxviii. 71, 2,

Ma Ellesponto, dove passò Xerse,
Ancora freno a tutti orgogli umani . . .

is derived from Lucan, since he definitely cites this passage in De Mon. II. ix. l. 55 *seqq.* from 'admirabilis Lucanus,' as his authority for the story of Xerxes. Also the 'moral' indicated in the second of the lines above quoted seems to be pointed at by Lucan in the epithet applied to Xerxes:

Tales fama canit *tumidum* super aequora Xerxem
Construxisse vias. (Phars. ii. 672, 673.)

(9)

Immediately following the above passage in the De Mon. we find some curiously unhistorical details about Alexander the Great, viz. that he sent ambassadors to demand the sub-

mission of the Romans, but died suddenly in Egypt before receiving their reply. This is (it is needless to say, erroneously) attributed to Livy. Then follows the statement that Alexander was buried in Egypt, and that 'his sepulchre remaineth with us unto this day'; and this is expressly made on the authority of Lucan, Phars. viii. 692–4. Mr. Toynbee has recently explained that this error probably arose from the confusion of Babylon in Assyria with Babylon (i. e. old Cairo) in Egypt. As Dante probably knew (1) that Alexander died at Babylon, and (2) that he was buried (according to Lucan) in Egypt, he might naturally have inferred that his death occurred at the Egyptian Babylon. There is another passage which seems to be explained by the same geographical confusion; viz. that in Inf. v. 60, where it is said of Semiramis,

Tenne la terra che il Soldan corregge.

We may now mention a few mythological, as distinguished from historical, incidents, for which Dante is indebted to Lucan, though Dante himself would probably not have drawn any strict line of distinction between these two classes of events.

(10)

The story of Antaeus was a favourite one with Dante. It is three times referred to in his prose works. In De Mon. II. x. (*fin.*), Dante combines this story with the conquest of Goliath by David, as pointing the same moral, 'si gentiles aliud peterent.' On the two other occasions he expressly brackets together Lucan and Ovid as his authorities. The former, however, is seen to be the chief source of his information. This appears also very clearly from the numerous interesting resemblances to the passage in Lucan which occur in Dante's account of Antaeus in Inf. xxxi. First of all Dante (l. 115 *seqq.*) describes the home of Antaeus as being in the valley where Scipio defeated Hannibal. Lucan, without

mentioning this battle, says that Curio placed his camp at Bagrada,

Antaei quae regna vocat non vana vetustas;
(see Phars. iv. 587–590)

and thence goes off to a description of Antaeus and his fabulous history. Bagrada was the site of the victory referred to by Dante, and he has substituted for the name of the place the great event which made it celebrated. Next, in l. 118,

Recasti già mille leon per preda,

we recognize Phars. iv. ll. 601, 2:

Latuisse sub alta
Rupe ferunt, epulas raptos habuisse leones.

Then the curious piece of flattery by which Virgil propitiates Antaeus in ll. 119–121, viz. that if he had been present with his brethren, the victory of Jupiter would have been doubtful, comes direct from Lucan, ll. 596, 7:

Coeloque pepercit,
Quod non Phlegraeis Antaeum sustulit arvis.

And of the lines immediately before,

Nec tam iusta fuit terrarum gloria Typhon,
Aut Tityus Briareusque ferox (ll. 595, 6),

we find the echo in Dante, l. 124,

Non ci far ire a Tizio nè a Tifo;

and also in ll. 103–5, when Briareus is declared to be 'più feroce' than Antaeus. Finally, the contest between Hercules and Antaeus, described at length by Lucan here, is referred to by Dante in l. 132:

Le man . . . Ond' Ercole sentì già grande stretta.

Compare Lucan, ll. 617 *seqq.*, and especially l. 633:

Constitit Alcides stupefactus robore tanto.

(11)

There is a very mysterious and obscure passage in Inf. ix. 22 *seqq.*, one portion of which at least, viz. the part played by the Thessalian witch Erichtho, seems clearly to be borrowed from

Lucan, Phars. vi. 507 *seqq.* We may compare especially Inf. ix. 25,

Di poco era di me la carne nuda,

with the point mentioned by Lucan, that the operations of Erichtho were by preference conducted upon bodies recently dead:

Ut modo defuncti tepidique cadaveris ora
Plena voce sonent; ne membris sole perustis,
Auribus incertum feralis strideat umbra. (ll. 621–623.)

And further, in reference to the particular shade of the Pompeian soldier recalled in the narrative of Lucan, we read:

Nam quamvis Thessala vates
Vim faciat fatis, dubium est, quod traxerit illuc,
Aspiciat Stygias, an quod descenderit, umbras. (ll. 651–653.)

Some commentators would extend the reference to Lucan still further by supposing Dante to be here speaking of this particular incident, and that the 'spirto del cerchio di Giuda' (l. 27) is none other than the spirit of this Pompeian soldier. There are several obvious objections to this. (1) Why should the intervention of Virgil be foisted into the story of Lucan? (2) Moreover, Virgil was still living at the time, and for many years after. (3) Why should this nameless soldier, who died in honourable fight, be condemned to the lowest circle of the Traitors?

Among others, Rossetti (*Com. Anal.*) holds this view as to Dante's reproduction and modification of Lucan's story; and he endeavours to answer these objections thus: (1) Virgil is brought in because the recalled spirit prophesied the victory of Caesar, i.e. the Empire. (2) Inf. ix. 25 (above quoted) may be taken to mean that Virgil was *still living*, but was only for a short time deprived of life for this purpose. This seems to me to be quite an unprecedented operation, in spite of the lines of Lucan cited by Rossetti:

Viventes animas, et adhuc sua membra regentes,
Infodit busto: fatis debentibus annos
Mors invita subit, perversa funera pompa
Retulit a tumulis, fugere cadavera letum. (ll. 529–532.)

(3) The soldier, in fighting for Pompey against Caesar, might be considered by Dante as a traitor to the Empire. But, if

so, he should not be in the 'cerchio di Giuda,' but (if a traitor at all) in 'Antenora.'

These answers all appear to me to be insufficient, and though unable to offer a satisfactory explanation of the passage, I do not feel able to accept this. It is no part of my purpose to discuss difficulties of interpretation except so far as they are associated with, or elucidated by, classical quotations or allusions. But in this case there is another explanation (suggested by Fransoni) which does fall under this head. He argues (1) the spirit (whoever he was) must have been condemned as a traitor in order to be found in the 'cerchio di Giuda'; (2) he must have been falsely so condemned, since his rescue was permitted; (3) the fact that Virgil was the chosen instrument of his deliverance implies that it was some one in whose rehabilitation Virgil was interested. He finds these conditions united in the case of Palamedes, of whom Virgil writes:

> Fando aliquod si forte tuas pervenit ad aures
> Belidae nomen Palamedis et inclita fama
> Gloria, quem *falsa sub proditione* Pelasgi
> Insontem infando indicio, quia bella vetabat,
> Demisere neci, *nunc cassum lumine lugent.*
> (Aen. ii. 81 *seqq.*)

[Dante might also have found the same story in Ovid:

> Mallet et infelix Palamedes esse relictus:
> Viveret, aut certe letum sine crimine haberet.
> Quem *male convicti* nimium memor iste furoris
> *Prodere rem Danaam finxit, fictumque* probavit
> Crimen. (Metam. xiii. 56 *seqq.*)

Again, ll. 308, 9:

> An *falso* Palameden *crimine* turpe
> Accusasse mihi, vobis damnasse decorum est?]

Thus Dante would be supposed to have combined passages in Virgil and Lucan, the former supplying the actual incident, and the latter the part assumed to have been played in it by Erichtho.

But ingenious as some points in this theory are, it is full of difficulties. Chiefly, I should ask, how could the false

condemnation of the Greeks be ratified, even temporarily, in the unseen world? In the words of Dante,

Per lor maledizion non sì si perde.

Further, 'Eriton cruda' would be strangely out of place as the author of the rectification of such a 'miscarriage of justice,' even if it could be supposed to have occurred. We need not perhaps lay much stress on the objection that Antenora and not Giudecca would have been the proper division for Palamedes, if treated as guilty of treachery to his country, for perhaps 'cerchio di Giuda' may be taken in a wide sense to include the whole of the ninth circle.

I do not myself think that the passage has ever yet been satisfactorily explained. Is it possible that Dante had access to some mediaeval romances or traditions about Virgil which are now forgotten? Of course Virgil figured prominently as a great magician in the Middle Ages, but I have found no trace of any such legend as this, nor does Comparetti's exhaustive work, *Virgilio nel medio Evo*, throw any light upon it.

The old commentators were as completely baffled as we are by this passage. Benvenuto (quaint and original as usual) thinks that it is useless to seek for any explanation, as the whole story is most likely a 'pious fraud' extemporized by Virgil to keep up the drooping spirits of Dante; and the Circle of Judas is brought in to show that his experience extends to the farthest extremity of Hell, as he seems to indicate in ll. 28–30. We may observe that at any rate Virgil, if he is lying, does not forget to 'stick to it,' for he twice afterwards refers to this journey, viz. xii. 34–6, and xxi. 61–3. Boccaccio confesses that he has never heard any satisfactory explanation. It is not, he says, admissible 'ai santi' to suppose that any condemned spirit, and certainly much less any other, could be liable to such molestation on the part of the living (a common-sense objection which may be recommended for the consideration of the modern spirit 'medium'). Samuel, he adds, was not really called up by 'the Pythoness,' but some foul spirit made up this airy simulacrum to deceive Saul.

(12)

Par. i. 16–18. Infino a qui l' un giogo di Parnaso
Assai mi fu, ma or con ambo e due
M' è uopo entrar nell' aringo rimaso.

The double peak of Parnassus is referred to both by Ovid and Statius, but the passage which Dante is generally supposed to have in his mind is Lucan, Phars. v. 72–4:

Parnassus gemino petit aethera colle,
Mons Phoebo Bromioque sacer: cui numine mixto
Delphica Thebanae referunt trieterica Bacchae.

It is true there is nothing in Dante relating to Bacchus in this connexion. Possibly he may have identified the Muses with Bacchus as his personified attributes, if he were acquainted with some of the Orphic writers. At any rate it is certain that one peak was sacred to Apollo, and Dante now has need of this as well as the other which sufficed before, and the comparison of Dante's previous invocations would tend to associate the other peak with the Muses. The following are all the earlier invocations which I remember: Inf. ii. 7 (Muses), xxxii. 10 (Muses); Purg. i. 8 (Muses, and especially Calliope, the Muse of Epic), xxix. 37–42 (Muses, and especially Urania). In contrast with all these stands this prayer to Apollo, and the demand for help from both peaks of Parnassus, for the 'ultimo lavoro' of the Paradiso.

(13)

Dante has borrowed the names of the various species of serpents in the seventh Bolgia, surpassing, as he says, those produced in Libya, Inf. xxiv. 85–7, from Lucan's description of the plagues of Libya in Phars. ix. 700 *seqq.* The five names given here by Dante all occur in Lucan, as well as many others.

Further, it seems not unlikely that the 'fiery little serpent' '*userpentello acceso*,' Inf. xxv. 83), to which such deadly effects

are attributed, may have been suggested by Lucan, Phars. ix. 762 *seqq.*:

> Miserique in crure Sabelli
> Seps stetit exiguus . . . . . .
> Parva modo serpens, sed qua non ulla cruentae
> Tantum mortis habet.

(14)

The reversed position of the Sun in the southern hemisphere referred to by Dante in Purg. iii. 89; iv. 56, 57; 119, 120; v. 4, 5, &c., is twice noticed by Lucan, viz. Phars. iii. 248:

> Umbras mirati nemorum non ire sinistras:

and ix. 538, 9:

> At tibi, quaecumque es Libyco gens igne diremta,
> In Noton umbra cadit, quae nobis exit in Arcton.

Also in Conv. III. v. ll. 116 *seqq.*, Dante refers to Lucan as his authority for the position of the equator on the surface of the earth.

(15)

In Par. vi. 58–60, Dante mentions six rivers together, the Var, the Rhine, the Isère, the Saone (Era), the Rhone, and the Seine, all of which occur in one context in Lucan, Phars. i. 399–465. Besides this, the events enumerated in ll. 64–70 may be traced to the same source, though no passages can be said to be definitely quoted.

(16)

It is interesting to note that the curious fancy of the spirits spelling out by their successive groupings the words *Diligite iustitiam*, &c. (Par. xviii. 76 *seqq.*), appears to be borrowed from Lucan, since at any rate the simile of the flock of birds (ll. 73–5), which in their migratory flight take the forms of letters, is found in Phars. v. 711–16:

> Strymona sic gelidum, bruma pellente, relinquunt
> Poturae te, Nile, grues, primoque volatu
> *Effingunt varias, casu monstrante, figuras:*
> Mox ubi percussit tensas Notus altior alas,
> Confusos temere immixtae glomerantur in orbes,
> *Et turbata perit dispersis litera pennis*[1].

[1] It may be noticed that each of the three *Cantiche* contains a simile derived from the migratory flight of the cranes. See also Inf. v. 46, and Purg. xxvi. 43.

The idea occurs again in Claudian[1], De Bell. Gild., 475–8, no doubt in imitation of this passage of Lucan:

> Ingenti clangore grues aestiva relinquunt
> Thracia, cum tepido permutant Strymona Nilo:
> Ordinibus variis per nubila texitur ales
> Littera, pennarumque notis inscribitur aer.

This passage of Lucan seems to have escaped the notice of Scartazzini, since he quotes one from Lucretius, to which the resemblance is much more distant, nor is there, I believe, any real evidence of Dante's acquaintance with Lucretius, either by way of quotation, or of mention of him in the Inferno (see *infra*, p. 295).

Though the imitation of Lucan seems undoubted, it does not appear to be sufficiently close to help us as to the *reading* at Par. xviii. 75 (see *Textual Criticism, &c.*, p. 466). But the reference to the two *rivers*, the Strymon and the Nile, as the habitats of the birds in Lucan, may well help us as to the disputed *interpretation* of 'riviera' in l. 73, and would lead us to adopt 'river' rather than 'bank' here. The commentators are divided on this point, and Dante undoubtedly uses the word in both senses elsewhere.

(17)

Purg. xiv. 31–33. Dov' è sì pregno
L' alpestro monte, ond' è tronco Peloro,
Che in pochi lochi passa oltra quel segno.

It seems to me that a probable reminiscence of a passage in Lucan may help us to interpret the much-disputed term

In the latter passage a needless difficulty has been made from the fact of Dante representing the northward and southward flight as taking place *simultaneously*, for the purpose of a poetic simile. The opposition there of the '*montagne Rife*' and the '*arene*' recalls that of the Strymon and the Nile in the passage of Lucan quoted in the text, as well as that of Thrace and the Nile in a similar context in Phars. vii. 832–4:

> Vos, quae Nilo mutare soletis
> Threicias hiemes, ad mollem serius Austrum
> Istis, aves.

Brunetto Latini (Tes. v. 27) gives a curious and minute account of the migrations of the cranes, 'che vanno a schiera, come i cavallieri che vanno a battaglia,' &c.

[1] Dante apparently did not know Claudian. In the undoubtedly spurious Italian epistle sometimes printed in his works, a quotation from Claudian occurs which is wrongly attributed to Virgil, 'minuit praesentia famam.'

pregno in this place, as has been suggested by several old commentators. The chief question is whether *pregno* here refers to the *form* of the Apennine chain at this point, or to its being a *prolific* source of streams of water. There is much force in Scartazzini's contention that the former sense of *pregno* is not found elsewhere in Dante, while the latter is; and we must also admit, I think, that the latter would seem to be *prima facie* the meaning of the passage by a natural association of ideas, since Dante is describing, so to speak, the birthplace of the Arno. But when we compare Phars. ii. 396–8,

> Umbrosis mediam qua collibus Apenninus
> Erigit Italiam, nullo qua vertice tellus
> Altius *intumuit*, propiusque accessit Olympo—

we are struck not only by the word *intumuit*, but still more by the similarity of sentiment in l. 33,

> Che in pochi lochi passa oltra quel segno.

It is, I think, a strong confirmation of this view that this very passage in Lucan (viz. ii. 396–438) is expressly referred to by Dante in De Vulg. Eloq. I. x. in illustration of the bird's-eye view of the physical geography of Italy which he there gives, making the Apennine range his starting-point. We may notice also that Lucan's description ends with a reference to the disrupted Pelorus:

> At postquam gemino tellus elisa profundo est,
> Extremi colles Siculo cessere Peloro. (ll. 437, 438.)

Compare with this l. 32 in Dante, as above quoted.

Finally we mention two or three passages in which quotations from Lucan may help to rectify or confirm certain readings in the text of Dante.

(18)

Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 142. Dammi li patti (*al.* le parti) degli antichi letti.

The false reading (said to be that of most MSS.) 'Dammi *le parti* degli antichi letti,' has in all recent editions been corrected to *li patti*. This is clearly required by the passage

in Lucan which Dante is here translating, viz. Phars. ii. 338 *seqq.*: note—

Da *foedera* prisci Illibata tori. (l. 341.)

(19)

Inf. xx. 46, 47. Aronta è quel che al ventre gli s' atterga,
Che nei monti di Luni, dove ronca
Lo Carrarese, &c.

Dante is here evidently thinking of Lucan, Phars. i. 586:

Aruns incoluit desertae moenia *Lunae.*

The reading of nearly all MSS. is said to be *Lucae* here, and this is now found in most recent editions, but Dante's MS. evidently had *Lunae*, since in the next lines he emphasizes the reference to the locality of Carrara and the Lunigiana, in which he had a special interest, having certainly spent a portion of his time in exile there, under the protection of the Malaspina. Comp. Purg. viii. 115 *seqq.*

(20)

In Conv. IV. xi. ll. 27 *seqq.* the early editions, and apparently several MSS. (including my own, dated 1493), read thus: 'Ciò testimonia Lucano, quando dice, a quelle [*sc.* le divizie] parlando: "Senza contenzione periro le leggi: e voi ricchezze, vilissima parte, moveste delle cose battaglia."' This should certainly be corrected, as it is by Fraticelli and others, to the following (which has also MS. support): 'e voi ricchezze, vilissima parte delle cose, moveste battaglia.' This becomes clear from a reference to the original, which will be found at Phars. iii. 119–121:

Pereunt discrimine nullo
Amissae leges: sed, pars vilissima rerum,
Certamen movistis, opes.

(21)

In De Mon. II. xi. ll. 46 *seqq.* Dante quotes three lines from Phars. ii. 135–8, the last line being in this form:

Ultra Caudinas *superavit* vulnera Furcas.

The reading now generally accepted is *speravit*, and *spiravit* is also given; but I find *superavit* recorded as occurring in old editions, and so no doubt it appeared in the MS. used by Dante.

STATIUS.

The prominent position assigned to Statius in the Divina Commedia, and the peculiar honour in which he was evidently held by Dante, have been sufficiently discussed in the introductory part of this Essay (see pp. 30 *seqq.*). We may, therefore, now proceed at once to speak of those passages from the Index which seem to call for some special remark.

(1)

First we will refer to the passage in the Purgatorio (xxi. 92), where Dante mentions the two works of Statius that were known in his day, viz. the Thebaid and the Achilleid; the Silvae having been discovered later[1]. The fragmentary character of the Achilleid is thus referred to:

> Cantai di Tebe, e poi del grande Achille,
> Ma caddi in via con la seconda soma.

It is even more interesting to note the evident reminiscence of the closing words of the Thebaid in the lines which follow, as it helps, I think, to settle a question of disputed interpretation. Statius, in a sort of valedictory address to his own poem, says—

> Vive, precor: nec tu *divinam Aeneida* tenta,
> Sed longe *sequere, et vestigia semper adora.*
> (Theb. xii. 816, 817)

Here is Dante's echo of this:

> Al mio ardor fur seme le faville,
> Che mi scaldar, della *divina fiamma,*
> *Onde sono allumati più di mille;*
> Dell' Eneida dico. (ll. 94–97.)

'Per te poeta fui,' says in effect the historical Statius; 'Per te poeta fui, per te Christiano,' exclaims the idealized Statius of Dante. It is strange that any one could doubt that the 'divina fiamma, Onde sono allumati più di mille'

[1] Similarly it will be found that in the contemporary *Registrum Auctorum* of Hugo von Trimberg (above referred to, pp. 165, 206), the Thebaid and Achilleid alone are mentioned.

could refer to anything but the 'divinam Aeneida' of the original passage of Statius, and that consequently *della divina fiamma* is the genitive after *faville*. But the words have sometimes been taken as the genitive of the material or instrument after 'scaldar,' and if so, they are explained to refer either to the Christian faith (e.g. Benv.), or sometimes to the fire of Poetry (e.g. Land.). But if the obvious reference to the language of Statius were not enough to settle the point, Dante himself declares in the next line, 'Dell' Eneida dico.'

(2)

Purg. xxii. 58. Per quello che Cliò teco lì tasta.

Dante thus refers to the Muse Clio (the Muse of History) as the special source of the inspiration of Statius. This is probably suggested by the appeal to Clio at the opening of the Thebaid (i. l. 41):

Quem prius heroum, Clio, dabis?

or by the still more direct invocation in x. 630, 631:

Memor incipe Clio,
Saecula te quoniam penes et digesta vetustas.

So again the 'Diva' invoked in the first words of the Achilleid, though not further described, is also from the context evidently Clio, whom Dante might well therefore regard as a sort of 'patron saint' of Statius.

(3)

Dante's own invocation to Apollo in Par. i. 13 *seqq.* bears evident traces of a recollection of that of Statius at the beginning of the Achilleid. Following the appeal to Clio, which has been mentioned above, Statius invokes the aid of Apollo, as we might say on his 'ultimo lavoro' (Par. i. 13). For though he does not employ exactly equivalent words, a similar thought appears in these lines:

Da fontes mihi, Phoebe, novos ac fronde secunda
Necte comas: neque enim Aonium nemus advena pulso,
Nec mea nunc primis albescunt tempora vittis. (ll. 9–11.)

Statius tacks on to these two invocations a very fulsome appeal to Domitian, as equally great in arms and in poetry, and as deserving the laurel wreath on both grounds:

> Cui geminae florent vatumque ducumque
> Certatim laurus. (l. 15.)

Echoing these words, Dante describes the laurel as gathered—

> Per trionfare o Cesare o Poeta (l. 29):

but the idea thus suggested is woven into the prolonged invocation to Apollo.

(4)

Another imitation of the Achilleid is found in Purg. ix. 31 *seqq.*, where Dante compares his own startled surprise on awaking from the vision of the Eagle, and finding himself transported to the Gate of Purgatory, with that of Achilles when carried off in his sleep by his mother from the custody of Chiron. The description of this comes from Statius, where we especially note the following lines:

> Quum pueri tremefacta quies oculique iacentis
> Infusum sensere diem: stupet aere primo,
> Quae loca? qui fluctus? ubi Pelion? omnia versa
> Atque ignota videt. (Achill. i. 247 *seqq.*)

(5)

The description of the aspect of the Furies in Inf. ix. 37–42 is evidently suggested by the description of Tisiphone in Theb. i. 103 *seqq.*:

> Centum illi stantes umbrabant ora *cerastae*,
> Turba minor diri capitis . . . (ll. 103, 4).
> . . *sanie* gliscit cutis (l. 107).
> . . haec vivo manus aera verberat *hydro* (l. 113).
> . . . . . fera sibila *crine virenti* (l. 115).

We recognize here most of the details of Dante's description:

> Tre furie infernal *di sangue tinte*,
> . . . . . .
> E con *idre verdissime* eran cinte:
> Serpentelli *ceraste* avean per *crine*
> Onde le fiere tempie eran avvinte.

(6)

In the episode of the mysterious messenger from heaven in Inf. ix. 82 *seqq.*, some of the old commentators have suggested that there is an imitation of the description of the descent of Mercury at the beginning of Theb. ii. (ll. 2 *seqq.*). The passage runs thus in Statius :

> Undique pigrae
> Ire vetant nubes, et turbidus implicat aer :
> Nec Zephyri rapuere gradum : sed foeda silentis
> Aura poli ; Styx inde novem circumflua campis,
> Hinc obiecta vias torrentum incendia claudunt.

Compare in particular :

> Dal volto rimovea quell' aer grasso (Inf. ix. 82).

There is no doubt a general similarity, and we have further the Styx mentioned in the context by both poets, though in a different connexion. Also in Theb. *l. c.*, l. 10, we have a 'medica . . . virga' introduced, which may possibly find an echo in the *verghetta* of l. 89 in Dante. The line seems to be quoted with this idea by Pietro di Dante, though the reference in Statius is variously explained as referring to a staff used by Laius, or to the *caduceus* of Mercury. Cerberus is also mentioned in both cases within a few lines. Compare Theb. ii. 27 and Inf. ix. 98. It is well known that the identification of the 'del (*al.* dal) ciel messo' (l. 85) is a most disputed and still unsolved problem. My chief reason for noticing this passage is that the probable imitation of Statius seems to have suggested to Pietro his identification of the 'messo' with Mercury, in which he is followed by Benvenuto. Daniello also quotes the passage from Statius.

(7)

The sudden disappearance into the earth of Amphiaraus in Inf. xx. 31 *seqq.* is borrowed from the description at the end of Thebaid, Bk. vii. and the beginning of Bk. viii. Mr. Butler has pointed out that Dante seems to have transferred the language which Statius puts into the mouth of Pluto—

> At tibi quos, inquit, Manes, qui limite praeceps
> Non licito per inane ruis? (Theb. viii. 84, 85)

to the Thebans—

Per ch' ei gridavan tutti: Dove rui?

If so, compare a similar case noticed in Par. ii. 18 as compared with Ovid, Met. vii. 118–120 (see Ovid, No. 31). It is curious to note the introduction of Minos in both passages, though with different associations; in Inf. xx. 36 as the minister of condemnation, and in Theb. viii. 27 *seqq.* as the minister of mercy:

Iuxta Minos cum fratre verendo
Iura bonus meliora monet, regemque cruentum
Temperat.

(8)

There is a specially interesting reference to Statius in the following lines:

Quali nella tristizia di Licurgo
Si fer due figli a riveder la madre,
Tal mi fec' io, ma non a tanto insurgo.
(Purg. xxvi. 94–96.)

The particular passage in the somewhat long episode (as usual) in Statius which explains this is:

Per tela manusque
Irruerunt, matremque avidis complexibus ambo
Diripiunt flentes, alternaque pectora mutant.
(Theb. v. 720–723.)

This describes the recognition of Hypsipyle, as she was being led to execution, by her two sons.

It is, as I say, specially interesting, because in the merely allusive character of the reference Dante appears to assume familiarity with the passage on the part of his readers also: otherwise the statement 'ma non a tanto insurgo' lacks its explanation. The meaning is (as Scartazzini points out) that Dante did not go so far as they did in the expression of his emotions, inasmuch as he did not actually run and embrace Guido Guinicelli. But only familiarity with the passage referred to could supply this necessary gloss. Dante again refers to the story of Hypsipyle in Purg. xxii. 112, where she is introduced as 'quella che mostrò Langia,' and again in Inf. xviii. 91 *seqq.*

(9)

Purg. xxi. 46–51.

Lubin in his *Studi* (p. 313) lays much stress on the distinct imitation of Theb. ii. 32–40 in this description by Dante of the perpetual calm on the Mountain of Purgatory. I do not find such direct reproduction of actual words or phrases as occurs elsewhere, but that there is a general imitation seems probable, especially as it would be a graceful touch (as we have noticed in the case of Virgil, *sup.* p. 180) for Dante to put into the mouth of Statius, at his first appearance, language borrowed or imitated from his own poem.

(10)

Inf. xxvi. 52–54. Chi è in quel foco, che vien sì diviso
Di sopra, che par surger della pira,
Ov' Eteòcle col fratel fu miso?

This comparison of the divided flame containing the spirits of Ulysses and Diomede to that which arose from the funeral pyre of Eteocles and Polynices, is clearly suggested by Statius, Theb. xii. 429–32. Especially compare the words 'exundant *diviso vertice* flammae' with those quoted above.

(11)

Inf. xxxii. 130, 131. Non altrimenti Tideo si rose
Le tempie a Menalippo per disdegno.

Dante thus confessedly borrows the 'bestial segno' of Ugolino's hatred of Ruggieri from the similar treatment of the skull of Menalippus by Tydeus described in Theb. viii. 739 *seqq.*

We may further compare, though the words (as often in such reminiscences) are applied differently, the expression 'Lumina torva' (l. 757) with 'gli occhi torti' in Inf. xxxiii. 76.

(12)

Par. xxv. 133–135. Sì come, per cessar fatica o rischio,
Li remi pria nell' acqua ripercossi
Tutti si posan al sonar d' un fischio.

Mr. Butler points out that this striking simile is borrowed from Statius, Theb. vi. 799 *seqq.*:

Sic ubi longa vagos lassarunt aequora nautas,
Et signo de puppe dato posuere parumper
Brachia.

(13)

Par. xxvi. 85-88. Come la fronda, che flette la cima
Nel transito del vento, e poi si leva
Per la propria virtù che la sublima,
Fec' io in tanto, &c.

This is another interesting case of a borrowed simile, which is pointed out by Scartazzini as being derived from Theb. vi. 854 *seqq.*:

Ille autem, Alpini veluti regina cupressus
Verticis urgentes cervicem inclinat in Austros,
Vix sese radice tenens, terraeque propinquat,
Iamdudum aetherias eadem reditura sub auras:
Non secus, &c.

The simile certainly loses nothing by its greater simplicity in Dante. (See *supra*, p. 182.)

(14)

Another curious imitation of Statius may be found in the *post mortem* defiance of Jove by Capaneus imagined by Dante in Inf. xiv. 51–60. This is evidently copied from the description by Statius, in the end of Thebaid, Bk. x, of the scene on the 'ultimo dì' (Inf. xiv. 54) of the life of Capaneus. In Dante, Capaneus boasts that if Jove were to employ all his artillery against him, as he did against the giants, 'alla pugna di Flegra,' he could not quench him. In Statius, it is Jupiter himself who replies to the defiance of Capaneus by referring to his victory at Phlegra:

Quaenam spes hominum tumidae post proelia Phlegrae?
Tune etiam feriendus? ait. (ll. 909, 910.)

Another 'echo' seems to occur in the expression

E me saetti *con tutta sua forza* (Inf. xiv. 59);

since something similar is found twice in this context in Statius:

Nunc *totis* in me connitere flammis (l. 904);

and again:

Talia dicentem *toto Iove* fulmen adactum
Corripuit. (l. 927.)

Once more, the impatient demand attributed by Capaneus to Jupiter for help,

Chiamando: 'Buon Vulcano, aiuta aiuta' (l. 57),

seems suggested by the words in Statius:

Fulmen, io ubi fulmen? ait (l. 889);

and again, l. 911,

Tela ultricia poscit.

This last demand is attributed by Statius to the impatience of the 'turba deûm frendens' urging on Jupiter, who is described as 'lentum.'

Curiously enough, another passage from Theb. ii. 599:

Hinc *lasso* mutata *Pyracmone* temnens
Fulmina

—also, be it noted, relating to the day of Phlegra, and also, as will be seen in the next passage discussed, in a context copied elsewhere by Dante—seems to have suggested the line:

Se Giove *stanchi* il suo fabbro. (l. 52.)

But more than this again, Dante reproduces the curious expression '*mutata fulmina*[1],' Theb. ii. 599, in a slightly different application:

O s' egli stanchi gli altri *a muta a muta*. (l. 55.)

Finally, it occurs to me to note that we have an argument for the reading *il suo fabbro* as against *i suoi fabbri* in l. 52, the reference being to the 'lasso Pyracmone' of Statius. To this we may add the obvious consideration of the antithesis between *il suo fabbro* in l. 52, and *gli altri* in l. 55. 'I suoi fabbri' is one of the readings characteristic of the 'Vatican family' of MSS. noticed in my *Textual Criticism, &c.*, Appendix II. I believe it is generally the case that, as here, they represent alterations for the worse, effected on an otherwise very good type of text.

(15)

It has sometimes been thought that one expression at least in Dante's description of the Giants overthrown by Jupiter, occurring in Purg. xii. 28 *seqq.*, has been suggested by Ovid, Met. x. 151 (see Scartazzini's note on 'sparte' in l. 33). But

[1] This would seem to refer to continual fresh supplies of bolts: 'bolt upon bolt.' Cf. the sense of χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος in St. John i. 16. It is sometimes taken as = *refecta*, or 'repaired,' which does not seem satisfactory.

undoubtedly Statius is his main authority here. Compare Theb. ii. 595 *seqq.*, where (as here by Dante) the overthrow of Briareus is described. In particular we find that the same three deities who are mentioned by Dante as looking on,

> Vedea Timbreo, vedea Pallade e Marte (l. 31),

appear in the same way in Statius:

> Hinc *Phoebi* pharetras, hinc torvae *Palladis* angues,
> Inde Pelethroniam praefixa cuspide pinum
> *Martis*, &c. (ll. 597–599.)

(Also note the repetition of the 'immensus Briareus' of l. 596 in the 'ismisurato Briareo' of Inf. xxxi. 98.)

It is to be observed however, (1) that Dante, while borrowing the incident of the three deities (just quoted), transfers it to the conquest of the Giants or Titans[1], whereas in Statius it comes in connexion with the story of Briareus[2]. (2) In

[1] A similar case is noted under Cicero, No. 9.

[2] I avail myself of this opportunity of correcting an error into which I was formerly led by this combination in Dante of the circumstances of two distinct incidents, and of explaining the principle of classification which he adopts in this passage of the Purgatorio. The error to which I refer occurs in Table VII, at the end of my little book on the *Time References in the Divina Commedia*, where I have placed Briareus and the Giants together as one group, whereas Dante, I think, clearly intended them to form two separate groups on the sculptured pavement. The numerous examples of abased pride were represented by me in three groups as follows:

1.	Lucifer.	2.	Niobe.	3.	Eriphyle.
	Briareus, &c.		Saul.		Sennacherib.
	Nimrod.		Arachne.		Cyrus.
			Rehoboam.		Holofernes.

Now there is an evident want of symmetry in the first group as compared with the others, since it contains only three members. Moreover Dante has taken especial pains to mark off four members in each group by the threefold series of four consecutive *terzine*, each beginning with '*Vedea*' for the first group, '*O*' for the second, and '*Mostrava*' for the third; and then the key-words of the three groups are again repeated in summary in one *terzina*, ll. 61–3. From this it is now perfectly clear to me that the first group should be:

1.	Lucifer.	
	Briareus.	
	The Giants.	
	Nimrod.	

This is not a cross-division, since (1) Briareus was not properly one of the band of Giants who scaled Olympus, though sometimes confused with them. He

Statius they are introduced as severally the objects of the defiance of that monster, while in Dante they are represented as contemplating triumphantly the carnage of the Giants. There are many cases in which Dante has borrowed with similar freedom of variation.

(16)

A special interest attaches to the citation of Theb. i. 671–681 in Conv. IV. xxv. ll. 109 *seqq.*, because of the comment which Dante makes upon it, viz. that when Polinices is asked by Adrastus as to his parentage, he is through shame reduced to silence, and at last, avoiding the name of his father Oedipus, he mentions his ancestors, his country, and his mother:

> Cadmus origo patrum, tellus Mavortia Thebe,
> Et genetrix Iocasta mihi.

defied heaven, it is true, but on a different occasion and in a different manner. Thus in the above passage of Statius he alone is referred to; and again in Aen. vi. 287, 'centumgeminus Briareus' is mentioned quite apart from the Titans (Othus, Ephialtes, Tityon, &c.), whose fate is described later on, ll. 580 *seqq.* (2) Further, Briareus belongs to a different breed or type. He and his two brethren were of a monstrous growth, with fifty heads and one hundred hands; while the Titans or Giants were at least human in form, and only superhuman in size and strength. (3) Once more, we may observe how naturally Lucifer and Briareus group themselves together on the one hand, each of them having lifted up himself in the pride of individual defiance against the majesty of heaven. So on the other hand there is a natural association between the Giants who attempted to scale heaven and Nimrod, at any rate in the form of the tradition concerning him which is consistently adopted by Dante, viz. that he was the chief builder of the tower of Babel, whose top was meant to reach to heaven (on this see *supra*, p. 73). (4) But I think there is yet another propriety of association in this subdivision into pairs of the first group of four, on what we perhaps might call chronological grounds. The bond of union of the first group of four, as compared with the other two groups, is that its members all belong to prehistoric tradition. But in the case of the first pair, Lucifer and Briareus, we are carried back, in sacred and profane legend respectively, to a period of very remote antiquity, out of all relation to mundane events or the life of the human race. But the latter pair of incidents, the attempt of the Giants (carried on in Thessaly) and the building of Babel (on the plain of Shinar), were associated with definite places, and a more or less definite time, in the history or supposed history of the world itself as the habitation of man. I have no doubt, therefore, that this was the symmetrical arrangement of the images or examples designed by Dante.

This makes it very probable that Dante hence derived the delicate touch which has often been admired in Purg. iii. 112, 113, when he makes Manfred declare:

> Io son Manfredi,
> *Nepote* di Costanza Imperadrice.

He avoids mentioning his mother, since he was illegitimate[1].

Three passages are now added, in which quotations from Statius seem to be available for purposes of textual criticism.

(17)

Conv. IV. xxv. ll. 60 seqq. E però dice Stazio, il dolce poeta, nel primo della *Tebana Storia*, che quando Adrasto . . . vide Polinice vestito (*al.* coverto) d' un cuoio di leone, e vide Tideo coverto d' un cuoio di porco salvatico, &c.

The reference is to Theb. i. ll. 390 *seqq.*, where we find that an oracle of Apollo had informed Adrastus, who had no sons—

> Hic sexus melioris inops, sed prole virebat
> Feminea (ll. 393, 394)—

as to his future sons-in-law, thus:

> Setigerumque suem, et fulvum adventare leonem (l. 397).

Later on, the fulfilment of this prophecy is found in the incident to which Dante here refers. See Statius, *l. c.*, ll. 483–492. In particular, we read there of Polynices, that he was clothed in a lion's skin, like Hercules who assumed the skin of the conquered lion of Cithaeron before he attacked the lion of Nemea or Cleonae. Note especially the words:

> Ante Cleonaei *vestitur* proelia monstri (l. 487).

Dr. Witte has ingeniously argued from this in favour of the reading *vestito*, which is found in some MSS. of the Convito.

[1] Benvenuto's note, though rather flippant, is characteristically quaint: 'he is like the mule who said he was the grandson of the horse, though he was the son of the ass!'

The resemblance is rather too minute to lay much stress upon, in the case of a quotation so vague and general. It is perhaps more to the point to observe that the change from *coverto* to *vestito* is not one that a copyist would be so likely to make as the converse change from *vestito* to *coverto*. The latter would introduce a more complete uniformity between two clauses which have already several words in common.

(18)

In Conv. IV. xxv. ll. 78 *seqq.* (shortly after the passage last discussed) Dante again quotes Statius for an example of the Virtue of Modesty (*Pudore*) as exemplified in the conduct of Argia and Deipyle, daughters of Adrastus. The point with which we are concerned is included in the words:

> Oculique verentes
> Ad sanctum rediere patrem. (Theb. i. 538, 539.)

This is represented by Dante thus: 'li loro occhi fuggiro da ogni altrui sguardo, e solo nella paterna faccia, quasi come sicuri, si (*al.* li) tennero vôlti.' (ll. 85–88.)

The following points in reference to the text may be noted. (1) The difference between 'li' and 'fi' in MSS. is very slight, as I have before observed, and these words are interchanged elsewhere in the Convito MSS. But *si* seems rather preferable here, partly because it avoids an awkward change in the nominative of the sentence, and partly because it corresponds more closely to the language of Statius quoted. (2) Some MSS. are said to omit 'vôlti.' The original *rediere* seems better represented by *si tennero vôlti* than by *si tennero* alone, and this would somewhat favour, though it would not necessitate, the retention of the word. (3) A more important point is that the reading in l. 82, '*santo* padre,' is fully guaranteed by 'sanctum . . . patrem' in the original. Giuliani strangely reads 'onesto padre,' and he does not give any reason for this change; but even if it should have some MS. support (of which I am not aware), the usual reading *santo* is clearly to be retained, from a consideration of the passage quoted.

It may be added that the names Argia and Deipyle, though not mentioned in this place in the Convito, occur in Purg. xxii. 110, together with several others taken from the works of Statius, and they are introduced by Virgil, who is addressing him, as 'delle genti tue.'

(19)

Conv. III. viii. ll. 93-95 seqq. Siccome dice Stazio poeta del tebano Edipo, quando dice che 'con eterna notte (*fals. lect.* nota) solvette lo suo dannato pudore.'

The false reading *nota* is found (*auct.* Fraticelli) in the earlier editions, and in nearly all the known MSS. of the Convito. The language of Statius in the passage quoted conclusively establishes the reading *notte*. It occurs in Theb. i. 47:

Merserat aeterna damnatum nocte pudorem.

My MS. of the Convito omits the disputed word altogether; a curious way of evading a difficulty, which has been noticed elsewhere. See *supra*, p. 36, and also under Vulgate, No. 12, and Ovid, No. 17.

JUVENAL.

Dante does not appear to have been very familiar with the works of Juvenal, indeed less so than we should have expected, since his splendid irony and sarcasm, as well as the epigrammatic vigour of his style, would have been likely to command Dante's admiration. We have, however, a few quotations and allusions, and in particular there is also the interesting mention of Juvenal in Purg. xxii. 13 *seqq.*, where he is represented as having conveyed to Virgil on his descent into Limbo the admiration in which he (Virgil) was held by Statius in the world above. We have in Conv. IV. xii. l. 84, a general reference to Juvenal, together with David, Solomon, Seneca,

and Horace, as having declaimed against 'the deceitfulness of riches.'

The following passages may be further noticed.

(1)

We find in De Mon. II. iii. l. 18 a direct quotation of Juvenal, from Sat. viii. 20:

> Nobilitas [animi] sola est atque unica virtus.

This is interesting (1) because it is put in contrast with the sentiment of Aristotle in Pol. IV (*al.* VI) viii. 9, where a nobility of position and descent is also recognized. This leads Dante here to assert that two different kinds of nobility are thus implied, 'propriam scilicet et maiorum.' He appears tacitly to acquiesce in this, though in Conv. IV. vii. he strongly insists on the former being the *sole* ground of nobility. (2) It will be observed that Dante (perhaps quoting from memory) inserts the important word *animi*, which is not found in Juvenal, but which adds to the aptness of the quotation for Dante's purpose, since it enables him to say that Juvenal and 'the Philosopher' are not at variance.

(2)

There is next a passage in Sat. vii. 82–5 which we strongly suspect to have lingered in Dante's memory.

> Curritur ad vocem iucundam et carmen amicae
> Thebaidos, laetam fecit quum Statius urbem,
> Promisitque diem. *Tanta dulcedine* captos
> Afficit ille animos, tantaque libidine vulgi
> Auditur.

We cannot but think that we have an echo of this passage in the epithet 'dolce,' twice applied to Statius by Dante:

> *Tanto fu dolce* mio vocale spirto (Purg. xxi. 88),

and again in Conv. IV. xxv. l. 60, 'E però dice Stazio, il *dolce* poeta.' In confirmation of this we may recall the way in

which Dante associates Juvenal and Statius in Purg. xxii. 14, 15. It might also be suggested that 'dolce' is not so obvious a description of Statius (especially considering the subjects of his poems), that it would have occurred spontaneously to Dante.

(3)

There is yet another place in Juvenal that may have been floating in Dante's mind when he describes the primitive simplicity of Florence in the words:

> Non v' era giunto ancor Sardanapalo
> A mostrar ciò che in camera si puote.
>
> (Par. xv. 107, 108.)

Pietro di Dante in his commentary quotes in illustration of this, Juvenal, Sat. x. 362:

> Et Venere et coenis et pluma Sardanapali.

Certainly the three forms of luxury alluded to by Juvenal seem to be not inaptly summarized by the words 'in camera' in Dante.

(4)

Finally we have the well-known line—

> Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator,

from Sat. x. 22, cited thus in Conv. IV. xiii. l. 108 *seqq.*, 'E però dice il Savio: "se vôto camminatore entrasse nel cammino, dinanzi a' ladroni canterebbe."' Here it seems to me nearly certain that Dante is quoting not from Juvenal, but from Boethius, who is no doubt reproducing, though without any indication of quotation, the sentiment of Juvenal[1]. We may observe: (1) the word 'Savio' would be more naturally applied to the former than to the latter[2]; (2) the form of

[1] It will be remembered that Dante once quotes a fragment of Homer as though it were Aristotle's language, because Aristotle cites the words (as being probably quite well known) without specifying that they come from Homer (see *supra*, p. 166, and also under Cicero, No. 2).

[2] It should be admitted, however, that this expression *il Savio* is applied two or three times to Virgil in the Divina Commedia, and once to Statius, Purg. xxxiii. 15, and to both together, Purg. xxiii. 8. Also in the Vita Nuova (§ xx. Son. x.) to Guido Guinicelli, and to the 'five great poets' collectively in Inf. iv. 110. This perhaps somewhat weakens the force of the first argument.

Dante's quotation more nearly corresponds to the language of Boethius than to that of Juvenal. The passage, which occurs in De Cons. Phil. ii. Pros. 5 (*fin.*), is as follows: 'Si vitae huius callem vacuus viator intrasses, coram latrone cantares.' Note 'entrasse nel cammino'; the hypothetical form '*se* . . . entrasse'; and also the order of the words 'vacuus viator.' (3) This view of the probable origin of Dante's citation is confirmed by the fact that the author of the Ottimo Commento quotes this line, in his long Proemio to Paradiso, Canto xi. (vol. iii. p. 262, ed. Pisa, 1829), quite definitely as coming from Boethius[1]. (4) As Dante elsewhere cites Juvenal by name, why should he not do so here, if he was aware that he was quoting him?

CICERO.

The quotations from Cicero in Dante's prose works are rather numerous, and though direct quotation is not to be expected in the Divina Commedia, there are several passages in which we can scarcely doubt that Dante has been indebted to Cicero. There is little or no evidence that Dante was acquainted with Cicero's oratorical works, and of about fifty quotations or references that I have been able to trace, it will be seen that rather more than one half come from either the De Officiis or the De Senectute. Next to these come the De Amicitia and De Finibus. Special interest attaches to the former of these two works, because in Conv. II. xiii. Dante traces his devotion to Philosophy mainly to the study of the De Amicitia of Cicero, and the De Consolatione of Boethius, to which he devoted himself when weighed down with 'overmuch sorrow' at the death of Beatrice. See further another such acknowledgement in Conv. II. xvi. (*init.*).

We will take first of all those passages in the Commedia in which we can trace the influence of Dante's Ciceronian

[1] Compare a very similar sentiment in Seneca, Epist. xiv., evidently also suggested by Juvenal originally—'Nudum latro transmittit; etiam in obsessa via pauperi pax est.'

studies, and then places in the Convito where use may be made of quotations from Cicero for the purpose of rectifying some of the numerous corruptions in the text of that work.

(1)

The most interesting and important in the former group of passages is undoubtedly that in which Dante enounces one of the leading principles in his classification of sins, viz. the distinction between sins of Violence and sins of Fraud, in Inf. xi. ll. 22 *seqq.* This is certainly derived from the De Officiis of Cicero (I. c. xiii. § 41), just as the other main principle, the distinction between sins of Incontinence (incontinenza, *ἀκρασία*) and those of Vicious Habit (malizia, *κακία*), is derived from the Ethics of Aristotle. The source of the distinction is directly acknowledged in the latter case, though not in the former. The reason would probably be, that for Dante the authority of Aristotle was almost as binding as that of Scripture; while that of Cicero would not have carried any such weight. But, in my judgement at least, there can be no more reasonable doubt as to the source of this distinction than of the other. As, however, I hope to discuss this at length in an Essay on Dante's Classification of Sins, I may refer my readers to that instead of pursuing the subject further at present.

I may perhaps insert here two or three quotations from the prose works which have no bearing on textual difficulties, but which illustrate Dante's familiarity with just that portion of the De Officiis in which the passage referred to under the last head is found, thereby increasing the probability that he had that passage in his mind. The first Book of the De Officiis is quoted or referred to about a dozen times by Cicero, and the seven chapters, xi to xvii, no less than six times, besides the case contended for above. Only the following seem to call for a brief special notice.

(2)

In De Mon. II. x. ll. 62 *seqq.*, Dante quotes the well-known lines of Ennius in reference to the refusal of Pyrrhus to

receive a ransom for the Roman captives. He does not mention Ennius, for neither does Cicero in De Officiis, I. xii. § 38, whence Dante no doubt derived the quotation. We may note the nearly similar phrases, 'de captivis redimendis,' in Dante, and 'de captivis reddendis' in Cicero; and still more the concluding words of Cicero—'digna Aeacidarum genere sententia'—which are echoed in Dante thus, 'Pyrrhus ille, tam moribus Aeacidarum quam sanguine generosus.' It will be observed that Dante closes the quotation with the words 'Dono ducite,' omitting the words 'doque volentibus cum magnis Dis.' He therefore took 'Dono ducite' together, treating 'Dono' as a noun, which is still advocated by some commentators. It is generally printed 'Dono, ducite, doque,' &c.

(3)

Another curious illustration of Dante's familiarity with this part of Cicero is shown by an evident quotation (though it is not specially acknowledged as such) from c. xvi. § 51, in Conv. IV. i. ll. 16, 17. Dante's words are—'per che in greco proverbio è detto: "Degli amici esser deono tutte le cose comuni."' This no doubt might have been obtained from Aristotle's Ethics, but in that case its source would probably have been acknowledged; and further, the language of Cicero is almost identical here—'ut in Graecorum proverbio est, "amicorum esse communia omnia."'

(4)

In the same context of the Convito (ten lines earlier), the next chapter of the De Officiis (c. xvii. § 56) supplies a similar proverbial dictum of Pythagoras—'quod Pythagoras vult in amicitia, ut unus fiat e pluribus,' or as Dante puts it, 'Onde Pittagora dice: "Nell' amistà si fa uno di più."'

(5)

Once more, in Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 110 *seqq.*, both Aristotle and Cicero are quoted together as authorities for a statement about the virtue of Liberality or *Larghezza*, but the language of Dante is borrowed more directly from the latter (viz. De

Off. I. xiv. § 42), especially in respect of the words, 'tale che il Largo non noccia a sè, nè ad altrui.' This closely corresponds with 'ne obsit benignitas et iis ipsis, quibus benigne videbitur fieri, et caeteris.' These words, it may be noted, almost immediately follow the passage referred to in (1), so that these four chapters, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, are at least five or six times quoted or referred to, as will be seen in the Index.

Returning now to the Divina Commedia.

(6)

Inf. xviii. 133–135. Taide è la puttana, che rispose
Al drudo suo, quando disse: 'Ho io grazie
Grandi appo te?' 'Anzi meravigliose.'

There can, I think, be no doubt whatever that Dante derived this reference to Thais, not directly from Terence (Eun. iii. 1), but from Cicero's citation of the passage in De Amicitia, c. xxvi. § 98[1]. For (1) there is no evidence of Dante's acquaintance with the works of Terence[2], whereas he was certainly very familiar with the De Amicitia. (2) The fact that Dante treats Thais as a real person, shows that he was not aware that she was merely a fictitious character in a play. Hence he derived the quotation, not from the play itself, but from a citation of it in which there was nothing to show that Thais was not historical. (3) We should not,

[1] Already spoken of *supra*, p. 12. Terence is, I believe, never quoted by Dante. He is named or referred to in general terms in Purg. xxii. 97, and also in Epist. x. § 10, in illustration of the meaning of the word *Comoedia*.

[2] I may add here that there is no evidence of Dante's acquaintance with the works of Plautus, who is also incidentally named by him in the same passage of the Purgatorio. An American correspondent has pointed out to me a remarkable resemblance to Plautus in a very celebrated passage in the Inferno, viz. the inscription over the Gate of Hell in Inf. iii. At the beginning of Bacchides, Act iii. Sc. 1, a Paedagogue who has traced his charge to a house of ill-repute speaks thus:

'Pandite atque aperite propere ianuam hanc Orci, obsecro!
Nam equidem haud aliter esse duco, quippe quo nemo advenit
Nisi quem spes reliquere omnes, esse ut frugi possiet.'

If Dante had seen this passage, I should suppose that he may have met with it in a Florilegium.

perhaps, lay too much stress on the slight error involved in Dante's attributing to Thais words which in the original were uttered by Gnatho. It may, however, be noted that in Cicero's citation the name of the speaker is not mentioned, while that of Thais occurs in the passage itself, and she might not unnaturally be understood to be the speaker. (4) The strongest point is that Cicero expressly gives this quotation as an example of the language of *flattery* (just as Dante does here), and further, that he explains the point of it to be the employment of the needlessly strong word *ingentes*, thus:—

> Magnas vero agere gratias Thais mihi?
> Satis erat respondere *magnas; ingentes* inquit.

(7)

The probable reminiscence of Somnium Scipionis, §§ 17–19, seems to throw light on the disputed interpretation of Inf. ii. 76–8, rendering that of Benvenuto da Imola the most probable, viz. that Theology raises the thoughts of man beyond this 'sublunary sphere,' and makes it 'reach forth to those things which are above,' or as is here said, 'above the moon.' Africanus (Cicero, *l. c.*), after explaining the order of the nine heavens, comes lastly to the 'infimus orbis Lunae.' Then he adds, '*Infra* autem iam nihil est nisi mortale et caducum, praeter animos generi hominum munere Dei datos, *supra lunam sunt aeterna omnia*'; and then Scipio is urged, 'haec caelestia semper speculato, illa humana contemnito.' Dante was likely to be familiar with the Somnium Scipionis, enforcing as it does the superiority of the Speculative over the Practical Life, a very favourite subject with Dante.

(8)

Inf. xii. 107. Quivi è Alessandro, e Dionisio fero.

It has been a matter of dispute from the earliest times whether this refers to (1) Alexander the Great; so *Jac.*, *Pet.*, *Ott.*, *Benv.*, *Lan.*, *Cast.*; or (2) Alexander of Pherae; so *Vell.*, *Dan.*; or (3) Alexander Balas of Jerusalem (see Maccabees and Josephus); so *Lan.*, and *Com. Anon.*, (i.e. *Bambaglioli*). It seems to me to be a strong argument (*inter alia*)

for Alexander of Pherae, that he and Dionysius are mentioned together by Cicero, de Off. II. c. vii. § 25, as typical instances of cruel tyrants whose life was made a burden to them through fear of those whom they had injured and oppressed. Castelvetro confidently says that Dante is referring to Lucan, Phars. x. 20,

> Illic Pellaei proles vesana Philippi
> Felix praedo iacet.

The reference to Cicero appears to me to be much more probable, apart from considerations as to the different language used by Dante elsewhere (especially de Monarchia), respecting Alexander the Great. Further, I would observe that Valerius Maximus also (IX. xiii. Ext. 3 and 4) unites the two names of Alexander of Pherae and Dionysius for precisely the same purpose as Cicero, *l. c.* This leads me to think that Dante is adopting a sort of stock combination of typical tyrants. It may also be noticed further that both Valerius Maximus, *l. c.*, and Cicero, Tusc. Disp. V. xx. § 57, mention the long duration of the tyranny of Dionysius (duodequadraginta annos), and possibly there may be an echo of this in Dante's words in the next line,

> Che fe' Sicilia aver dolorosi anni.

(9)

Par. v. 70. Onde pianse Ifigenia il suo bel volto.

It seems most likely that this allusion to Iphigenia is taken from Cicero, de Off. III. c. xxv. § 95—'Agamemnon quum devovisset Dianae quod in suo regno *pulcherrimum* natum esset illo anno, immolavit Iphigeniam, qua nihil erat in eo quidem anno natum pulchrius. Promissum potius non faciendum, quam tam tetrum facinus admittendum fuit.' In exact accordance with this version of the legend, Dante mentions the *beauty* of Iphigenia as the cause of her fate. Further, Dante's reflection in the lines before this is simply a paraphrase of Cicero's decision (see above) on this 'case of conscience':

> Cui più si convenia dicer: 'Mal feci,'
> Che servando far peggio.

Only it is curious to note that '*cui*' refers to Jephthah, to

whom Dante transfers this sentiment. The principle involved in the two cases is the same, and Dante has, according to his usual practice, illustrated the matter in hand by duplicate examples, one taken from sacred, and the other from profane history[1]; and by the connecting words—

E così stolto
Ritrovar puoi lo gran duca dei Greci—

he implies that the principle above enounced is equally applicable to both cases.

(10)

Purg. xix. 19–24. 'Io son,' cantava, 'io son dolce Sirena,
Che i marinari in mezzo mar dismago;
Tanto son di piacere a sentir piena.
Io volsi Ulisse del suo cammin vago
Al canto mio; e qual meco si ausa
Rado sen parte, sì tutto l' appago.'

It is commonly objected that, according to the Homeric legend, Dante resisted the Sirens, though he yielded to Circe (see Inf. xxvi. 91, 2). Hence commentators have charged Dante, either with confusing the two narratives, or of supposing Circe to be a Siren. I think it is probable that Dante may have derived his ideas, not from Homer[2] (whom in any case he did not know directly), but from Cicero, de Fin. V. xviii. § 49, a work familiar to him, as the Index shows. Cicero thus translates a passage in Homer:

O decus Argolicum, quin puppim flectis, Ulixes,
Auribus ut nostros possis agnoscere cantus!
Nam nemo haec umquam est transvectus caerula cursu,
Quin prius astiterit vocum dulcedine captus,
Post, variis avido satiatus pectore Musis,
Doctior ad patrias lapsus pervenerit oras.

[1] See illustrations of this given *supra*, p. 26.

[2] As to the source of Dante's legend of the fate of Ulysses, which does not appear in any ancient author or in the mediaeval works under the names of Dictys and Dares, it has been suggested by Dr. Schück (*Dante's Classiche Studien*, in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, &c., Band 92) that Dante may have constructed it himself out of the Genoese voyages of discovery in search of a Western continent, which resulted ultimately in the discovery of America, but which up to this time had proved fruitless. One such expedition left in 1291, and was never heard of again. With this general idea Dante may have combined the well-known fable, repeated by the crusaders and others, of the Mountain of Loadstone by which ships were attracted and dashed to pieces.

Further, Cicero comments upon this—'Vidit Homerus probari fabulam non posse, si cantiunculis tantus vir irretitus teneretur. Scientiam pollicentur, quam non erat mirum sapientiae cupido patria esse cariorem. Atque omnia quidem scire, cuiuscumque modi sint, cupere curiosorum; duci vero maiorum rerum contemplatione ad cupiditatem scientiae, summorum virorum est putandum.'

In the verses of Cicero it is easy to see several points of resemblance with the lines of Dante, though there may be no actual quotation. In his comment upon them we observe (1) that he implies (as Dante does) that Ulysses was ensnared (*irretitus*); (2) that, in Cicero's opinion, knowledge, not mere pleasure, must have been the ground of attraction in the case of 'tantus vir,' and that it is a sign of greatness of character to be so attracted. This corresponds with the burning desire of knowledge, which is so conspicuous a feature in Dante's conception of Ulysses (see Inf. xxvi. 97–99, 119, 120); (3) Cicero specially contrasts the superior attraction of knowledge over that of even country and home in the case of Ulysses. This again finds an echo in Inf. xxvi. 94–99.

The interpretation put upon the ordinary legend by Cicero, reminds us of the story of the temptation in Genesis—'In the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil' (Gen. iii. 5). Dante, it is true, on other occasions, seems to follow the ordinary interpretation which associates the Sirens with pleasures of sense, e.g. Purg. xxxi. 44, 45:

> Perchè altra volta
> Udendo le Sirene sie più forte,

as interpreted by ll. 34, 35:

> Le presenti cose
> Col falso lor piacer volser miei passi;

and in Epist. v. § 4, he says, 'Nec seducat illudens cupiditas, more Sirenum, nescio qua dulcedine vigiliam rationis mortificans[1].' But pleasure is still pleasure, though it may be of a higher or nobler type in some cases than in others; and it is still to be shunned, if even in its higher forms it tempts men

[1] Add also the vision of the Siren in Purg. xix. 19 *seqq.*

to leave the path of duty. Not to allow this would be equivalent to recognizing the vicious plea of 'Corban.' So there would be no inconsistency between this and other passages of Dante. Compare what Aristotle says in Nic. Eth. II. iii. 7 about τὸ ἡδὺ including τὸ καλὸν and τὸ συμφέρον.

(11)

Inf. xxxiv. 67. E l' altro è Cassio, che par sì membruto.

It was ingeniously suggested by Cardinal Mai that when Dante describes C. Cassius as *sì membruto*, he is perhaps confusing him with L. Cassius, the fellow conspirator of Catiline. See Cicero, in Cat. III. vii. § 16, 'L. Cassii adipem.' C. Cassius is twice described by Plutarch (whom Dante probably had not read—at least there is no evidence of it) as pale, thin, and slender in form. In the Life of Caesar, ch. lxii., Caesar is represented as saying, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν οὐ λίαν ἀρέσκει, λίαν ὠχρὸς ὤν. This idea is familiar to us from its reproduction by Shakspeare [1],

> Yond' Cassius hath a lean and hungry look:

and a little later—

> Would he were fatter! . . .
> . . . . . .
> I do not know the man I should avoid
> So soon as that spare Cassius.

Also in Plutarch's Life of Brutus, ch. xxix, Cassius is represented both as older and also as *less robust* than Brutus, in curious contrast with the 'sì membruto' of Dante: 'ἡλικίᾳ τε προὔχοντα, καὶ σώματι πονεῖν ὁμοίως μὴ δυναμένῳ χρώμενον.'

I know of no other evidence whatever of Dante's acquaintance with Cicero's oratorical works. But this difficulty would perhaps be met by the following statement made by Cardinal Mai in his note, *l. c.*: 'Tullii Catilinariae cum paucis aliis eiusdem orationibus aetate Dantis *regnabant in scholis*.' It does not appear on what authority this statement is made.

(12)

It is clear that Dante derived his knowledge of the meaning of the Greek ὁρμὴ (or, as he calls it, 'hormen') from Cicero,

[1] Julius Caesar, Act i. Sc. 2.

though this is not acknowledged. There are two passages where this is mentioned: (1) Conv. IV. xxi. l. 120, 'l'appetito dell' Animo, il quale in Greco è chiamato *hormen*'; (2) in the following chapter, l. 34, 'un rampollo, che gli Greci chiamano *hormen*, cioè appetito d' animo naturale.' Compare with this De Fin. III. vii. § 23, 'Appetitio animi, quae ὁρμὴ Graece vocatur'; and V. vi. § 17, 'Appetitum animi, quem ὁρμὴν Graeci vocant. Quid autem sit, quod ita moveat itaque a natura in primo ortu appetatur, non constat, deque eo est inter philosophos, quum summum bonum exquiritur, omnis dissensio.' The latter passage was more probably the one in Dante's mind; for (1) the context in Dante, including some of the expressions, such as 'il primo e nobile rampollo' (c. xxi. l. 118), and 'dalla divina bontà, in noi seminata e infusa dal principio della nostra generazione,' &c. (c. xxii. l. 33), resembles the language of Cicero in this passage; and (2) *hormen* corresponds with ὁρμὴν in this passage, rather than the form ὁρμὴ in the other, and Dante would probably blindly copy the form, without understanding the inflexion[1]. On the other hand, the reference a few lines before (c. xxii. l. 16) to the De Finibus, is to Bk. III. c. vi. § 22, only a few lines before the former passage in which ὁρμὴ occurs.

We next proceed to passages where quotations from Cicero bear upon questions of reading or interpretation, or where they present some other feature calling for remark.

(13)

I have already pointed out in the *Textual Criticism of the Divina Commedia*, p. 385, how a passage in the De Senectute (c. xxii. § 80), with which, as we have seen, Dante was very familiar, strongly supports the reading—

Più dalla carne, e *men* da' pensier presa,

as against

Men . . . . . e *più* . . . . . .

[1] As in the case of *Antictona*, for which see *supra*, p. 128.

I need not repeat what I have there said, except so far as to note the peculiar interest attaching to this variant, since it is found discussed by Pietro in his Commentary written within twenty years of Dante's death; and Pietro, too, as I venture to think, comes to a wrong decision on the subject.

(14)

Conv. IV. vi. ll. 125 seqq.

See Cicero, Acad. I. c. iv. §§ 16, 17.

The account given here of the Academic and Peripatetic philosophers has so many points of contact and similarity with the above passage from Cicero (which is too long to quote here), that Dante must almost certainly have had it in his mind. We have the two pairs, Plato and his nephew Speusippus, with Aristotle of Stagira and Xenocrates of Chalcedon, common to both passages. Note, too, the language of Cicero: 'Xenocratem Chalcedonium et Aristotelem Stagiritem,' from which we should probably be more correct in replacing the blundering efforts of the copyists, e.g. 'Scargere,' or 'Scargieri,' by the word *Stagirita* rather than by *da Stagira*, as is usually done (e.g. Edd. Mil., Frat., Giul., &c.)[1]. Again, in l. 132, Dante observes that Aristotle, by a sort of divine genius, while using mostly the methods of Socrates and the Academics, made an enormous advance upon their results. Compare Cicero, 'Nihil enim inter Peripateticos et illam veterem Academiam differebat. Abundantia quadam ingenii praestabat, ut mihi videtur, Aristoteles; sed idem fons erat utrisque' (§ 18). Once more, Cicero brings out prominently the negative character of the philosophy of Socrates: 'ita disputat, ut nihil affirmet ipse, refellat alios' (§ 16): 'illam autem Socraticam dubitationem de omnibus rebus, et nulla affirmatione adhibita consuetudinem disserendi reliquerunt' [*sc.* Academici] (§ 17). Compare Dante, l. 128: 'Nè da Socrate non presono vocabolo, perocchè nella sua filosofia *nulla fu affermato*.

[1] Also, it may be added, the MSS. do not read either *di* or *da* before the word which they present.

(15)

In Conv. IV. xv. l. 123, Dante, without making a definite quotation, refers to Cicero in the first Book of the De Officiis for the denunciation of a certain vice, which makes men so presumptuous as to think they know everything of themselves, and causes them to declare things to be certain, which are not so. This description, combined with the reference to Cicero, enables us to correct an obvious blunder in the MSS. a few lines above. Dante declares (ll. 117 *seqq.*) that there are three terrible maladies which he has observed in the minds of men, and he proceeds:—'l' *una* è di naturale *sustanzia* causata,' according to the reading of all the MSS. It is obvious that *sustanzia* is not a vice at all, and the word makes no sense in this context. It is, however, the antecedent to 'lo qual vizio,' the effect of which Dante describes in the words above quoted, and the severe reprobation of which he ascribes to Cicero. The context seems to imply some form of boastfulness or overweening self-confidence. And such a fault is in fact denounced by Cicero in De Officiis, I. c. xxvi. §§ 90, 91: 'quum homines inflati opinionibus turpiter irridentur, et in maximis versantur erroribus.' He also declares that the greater a man's prosperity and success, the greater is the need of his seeking and accepting the advice of friends. Such men as Dante is describing, on the contrary, never ask, and even repudiate, all such help; see ll. 130 *seqq.* On turning to the beginning of the chapter in Cicero, where its subject is announced, we read: 'Atque etiam in rebus prosperis . . . *superbiam, fastidium, arrogantiamque* magno opere fugiamus.' This would seem fully to justify the alteration (which is a very slight one) of the unmeaning *fuftanzia* into *jattanzia*.

(16)

There is a good instance of the value of a quotation in correcting a corrupt text in Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 19. The *lect. vulg.* ran thus: 'Certo corso *alla* nostra *buona* età *è* una vita semplice e quella della nostra buona natura.' But the passage

here definitely quoted from De Sen. c. x. § 33, is as follows:— 'Cursus est certus aetatis et una via naturae eaque simplex, suaque cuique parti aetatis tempestivitas est data.' This seems to justify the corrections generally made by modern editors, viz.: 'Certo corso *ha la* nostra età *e* una via semplice, quella della nostra buona natura: e a ciascuna parte della nostra età è data stagione a certe cose.'

It will be remembered that *alla* and *ha la* are practically the same in many MSS.; so also are *è* and *e*; and in the case of the *e* following *semplice*, its similarity with the final letter of the preceding word makes it almost optional, and a mere matter of 'editing,' whether we insert it or not. The repetition of *buona* with *età*, as well as *natura*, seems to be a mere blunder.

(17)

Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 134 seqq. Dice Tullio . . . nel libro *degli Officii*: 'Sono molti certo desiderosi d' essere apparenti e gloriosi, che tolgono agli altri per dare agli altri; credendosi essere buoni tenuti, se arricchiscono [gli amici] per qual ragione esser voglia. Ma ciò tanto è contrario a quello che fare si conviene, che nulla è più.'

This passage is found in Cicero, de Off. I. c. xiv. § 43:— 'Sunt autem multi, et quidem cupidi splendoris et gloriae, qui eripiunt aliis quod aliis largiantur: hique arbitrantur se beneficos in suos amicos visum iri, si locupletent eos quacumque ratione. Id autem tantum abest officio, ut nihil magis officio possit esse contrarium.'

All editors seem to agree in inserting 'gli amici' here, partly from the want of an object to *arricchire*; partly from the previous context, which seems to imply the enrichment of others, rather than oneself, by dishonest means; and still more from the general purpose of the passage of Cicero, which is very closely and accurately followed by Dante, and in which the enrichment of friends is a prominent feature. I do not feel quite confident of the necessity of such an insertion, but it seems fairly reasonable, as the accidental omission of the words by an early copyist might account for their disappearance from existing MSS. The very slight change of *certi*

to *certo* seems to be justified by the original 'sunt *autem* multi,' especially as *certo* would be almost sure to fall under the attraction of *molti*, and become *certi*.

(18)

The direct quotation of Cicero, de Sen. c. xxiii. § 83, in Conv. IV. xxviii. ll. 45 *seqq.*, enables us again to rectify a corruption in the text. The words in Cicero are: 'Equidem efferor studio patres *vestros*, quos colui et dilexi, videndi: neque vero eos solum convenire aveo, quos ipse cognovi, sed illos etiam, de quibus audivi et legi et ipse conscripsi.' The *lect. vulg.* ran thus: 'A me pare già vedere e levomi in grandissimo studio di vedere li *nostri* padri che io amai, e non pur quelli, ma eziandio quelli di cui udii parlare.' The two following corrections seem to be justified:—(1) Certainly the change of *nostri* to *vostri* (words that are constantly interchanged, and which are nearly indistinguishable in many MSS.); (2) probably the omission of the initial words, '*A me pare già vedere e.*' For (*a*) the passage in Cicero pointedly begins with *Equidem efferor*, &c., without anything at all corresponding to these words. (*b*) They run awkwardly, not to say inconsistently, with the words that follow, since if Cato already seems to see them, it is rather an anticlimax to add that he eagerly desires to see them. (*c*) The words in themselves look suspiciously like an 'improvement' of the quotation, to make it more directly apposite to the preceding words which it is adduced to illustrate, viz. '*vedere le pare coloro*,' &c. (3) Previous editors have agreed to insert after 'non pur quelli,' the words 'ch' io stessi conobbi,' to correspond to 'quos ipse cognovi,' but I scarcely feel that we are entitled to do this without further evidence, since the whole of the latter part of the quotation is somewhat curtailed, and these words may have been omitted in that process, since the essential part of the quotation has already been sufficiently given.

(19)

There is a curious misquotation of Cicero, 'nel primo degli Officii,' in Conv. IV. xxv. l. 95: 'Nullo atto è laido, che non

sia laido quello nominare.' What Cicero really says is quite different, viz.: 'Quod facere turpe non est, modo occulte, id dicere obscenum est' (I. xxxv. § 127). Dante's memory seems at fault here, since he apparently had a definite recollection as to the source from which he is quoting, otherwise we might have thought that he may have been misled by a passage in the Tesoro of Brunetto Latini, Bk. VII. c. xiv. *fin.* (ed. Venice, 1533): '*Socrate* disse, "ciò che è laido a fare io non credo che sia onesto a dire."'

(20)

From a longish quotation of Cicero, Paradoxa, ch. i. § 6, occurring in Conv. IV. xii. ll. 55 *seqq.*, in which the original is closely followed throughout, it appears as though Dante had read *dixi* instead of *duxi*—a case exactly similar to one noticed in reference to Ovid (No. 16). The portions bearing on this point are as follows:—'nè l' allegrezze, delle quali massimamente sono astretti, tra cose buone o desiderabili essere *dissi*.' In Cicero the passage is: 'neque eas quibus maxime astricti sunt voluptates, in bonis rebus aut expetendis esse *duxi*.' I can find no evidence of any such variant as *dixi* recorded.

(21)

There is a curious variation in a quotation of a passage in the De Officiis in De Mon. II. x. l. 38. Dante quotes Cicero thus: 'Sed bella, quibus Imperii *corona* proposita est, minus acerbe gerenda sunt.' The quotation is accurately made from De Off. I. xii. § 38, except in the substitution of the word *corona* for *gloria*. I can find no variant recorded in the passages either of Cicero or Dante.

(22)

In Conv. IV. xxiv. ll. 108 *seqq.*, there seems little doubt that the illustration from the vine is derived from the De Senectute, xv. §§ 52, 53, since we have seen that Dante was specially familiar with that work. It is to be observed that the two illustrations by which the 'argument from design' in 'la buona Natura' is illustrated, viz. the tendrils to support the branches

of the vine, and the leaves to protect its fruit, occur in both passages, though in inverted order. We may compare the way in which twice in ch. xxviii similes or illustrations have evidently been suggested by the De Senectute—the comparison of death in old age to the dropping of ripe fruit from the bough (l. 28), and that of the soul at death returning to its own home, after living as a stranger at an inn (l. 51). See De Sen. §§ 71 and 84 respectively.

(23)

Finally, we note what seems to be a pseudo-Ciceronian quotation in Conv. IV. xxix. l. 72:

> E però dice Tullio, che 'l figliuolo del valente uomo dee procurare di rendere al padre buona testimonianza.'

I have been unable to find anything like this anywhere in Cicero, and some friends who have made a special study of Cicero, have been equally unable to identify the quotation. The absence of the usual definite reference to the Book, as well as to the author, is suspicious, and disposes me to think that Dante was probably quoting secondhand from some collection of 'Adagia,' &c., in which this sentiment may have been assigned to Cicero. This certainly seems to explain some doubtful quotations elsewhere, e.g. from Aristotle, in Conv. IV. xi. l. 83, and from Seneca, in Conv. IV. xii. l. 120[1]. There can be no doubt that before the days of printed books, many references and quotations must necessarily have been obtained from such sources, and not directly from the authors cited.

LIVY.

Dante's citations of Livy present many curious features. The references given in the Index, and also some of the characteristics exhibited by the passages discussed in the next few pages, seem to point to the conclusion that Dante's acquaintance with Livy was slight, and probably mostly at

[1] See under Aristotle, No. 71, and under Seneca, *infra*, p. 288.

second hand. (1) We note that the references, such as they are, come almost entirely from the first few Books. (2) It is very significant that, in the case of Livy, Dante entirely departs from his usual practice of specifying the number of the Book from which he is quoting, as for instance in the cases of Aristotle, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, Cicero, &c.[1] In no single case does he do so for Livy. He is usually content to refer to 'Livy' quite generally, but when he attempts in any way to specify the source of the quotation, it is only in such vague expressions as—'nella prima parte del suo volume' (Conv. III. xi. l. 31); 'in prima parte' (De Mon. II. iv. l. 33, and xi. l. 37); 'in prima parte sui voluminis' (De Mon. II. iii. l. 34); 'in bello Punico' (De Mon. II. iv. l. 64). (3) The statements attributed to Livy are in some cases not found there at all, being in fact apocryphal, and in other cases very partially so found. Occasionally the language of Dante corresponds more nearly with what is found in Orosius, or perhaps (as Dr. Schück suggests[2]) even in Florus. The general impression left on my mind is that Dante probably used some historical epitome, and either on its authority, or perhaps on grounds of general probability, assumed that Livy would be the natural source from which such information would be derived. This impression is strongly confirmed when we find a pure fable like that connected with Alexander the Great (see *infra*, p. 278) fathered upon Livy[3], in whose works there is no trace of it, so that it is not a question of inaccuracy of memory in mere details.

The following are the passages which seem to call for some special remark.

(1)

The reference to Livy in Inf. xxviii. 12, as the authority for the story of the bushels of rings of the slain Romans collected by Hannibal after the battle of Cannae, seems to explain the epithet *alte* as applied to *spoglie* in that passage. Livy (xxiii. 12) speaks of 'annulos aureos, qui tantus *acervus*

[1] See *supra*, pp. 15, 96. [2] *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1865.
[3] See also p. 277, under No. 5.

fuit, ut metientibus dimidium super tres modios explesse, sint quidam auctores. Fama tenuit quae propior vero est, haud plus fuisse modio.' The word *acervus* seems to indicate that *alte* means 'high-heaped' (as Plumptre, &c.), not 'illustrious' (as Longfellow). The latter part of the quotation may perhaps throw some light on the words 'che non erra,' added here in reference to Livy. It is not an attribution of general infallibility, but has rather, perhaps, a special bearing on the truth of this surprising statement. I once thought that it was just possible that it might have some reference to Livy's sober (or perhaps patriotic?) correction of the exaggerated figures of the alternative tradition. But it is to be observed that when Dante again refers to this incident in Conv. IV. v. l. 167, he unhesitatingly adopts the story of three bushels. It looks certainly as if he had there in view Orosius' account of the matter in IV. xvi. § 5, since Orosius mentions it in close conjunction with the patriotic service rendered by Scipio, to which Dante also here refers. This, however, might have come from Livy, xxii. 53, but there it occurs in quite a different context.

(2)

Dante twice alludes to the deliverance of the Capitol from the Gauls through the alarm raised by the sacred geese. In one of these places, De Mon. II. iv. l. 48, he appeals to the authority of 'Livius et multi scriptores illustres.' It is remarkable that in both cases, viz. De Mon. *l. c.* and Conv. IV. v. ll. 161 *seqq.*, he speaks of a single goose, 'anserem ibi non ante visum'—'la voce d' un' oca.' Further, he adds an element of marvel to the story by introducing the words, 'ibi non ante visum.' I have not been able to trace this feature of the story, but both Florus, i. 15, and Virgil, Aen. viii. 655 (in the description of the shield of Aeneas), speak of one goose, whereas Livy, v. 47, says 'anseres,' and also mentions that they were sacred to Juno. It would seem then that Dante could scarcely have had before him the passage from Livy, but he may have found these variations of detail in some of the 'multi scriptores illustres' who are mentioned with him.

(3)

The case in regard to Dante's references to Cincinnatus is very like that last discussed. Twice he describes his being taken from the plough, and his return to it again on resigning the dictatorship. This latter circumstance is distinctly stated both in De Mon. II. v. ll. 76 *seqq.*, and Conv. IV. v. ll. 130 *seqq.*[1] Also in the former case, but not in the latter, the incident is recorded on the authority of Livy. But Livy, though mentioning the prompt resignation of the dictatorship by Cincinnatus, says nothing about his return to the plough[2]. It is, however, stated by Florus i. 13—'expeditione finita rediit ad boves rursus triumphalis agricola.' But it was probably a matter of common tradition which Dante may have picked up anywhere. Dr. Witte refers to a passage in Orosius as the source of Dante's information, and though neither does Orosius explicitly mention the return of Cincinnatus to his plough, yet there are some curious points of similarity between Dante and Orosius which suggest a relationship between the passages. Dante says—'sceptro imperatorio restituto Consulibus, sudaturus post boves ad stivam libere reversus est.' Orosius somewhat rhetorically—'Jugum boum Aequis imposuit, victoriamque quasi stivam tenens, subiugatos hostes prae se primus egit' (Adv. Pag. II. xii. § 8). It is curious that Livy expresses a doubt whether Cincinnatus was digging or ploughing, 'seu fossam fodiens, palae innisus, seu quum araret; operi certe, id quod constat, agresti intentus' (III. xxvi). There is no trace of this question in Dante.

(4)

Another inaccurate reference to Livy occurs in the case of Camillus, in De Mon. II. v. ll. 102 *seqq.* Dante describes, 'on the authority of Livy' (secundum Livium), that Camillus, having been exiled (as in fact he was) for alleged malversation in reference to the spoils of Veii (Livy, V. xxxii. *ad fin.*,

[1] It has been already observed how closely these passages of the De Monarchia and the Convito correspond, in respect of the numerous examples from Roman history, both with one another and with St. Augustine, De Civ. Dei, v. 18. See *supra*, p. 188.

[2] Livy III. xxix.

and also c. xliii), magnanimously delivered Rome from the Gauls, and then returned into a second and voluntary exile, refusing to remain at Rome until the former sentence was repealed in due form of law. This is even more explicitly set forth in the Convito (IV. v. ll. 134 *seqq.*), though Livy is not there mentioned. Now Livy says nothing about this second exile, but he does mention the recall from the first exile as having been formally carried out, 'consulto senatu,' the law-abiding spirit of the *people* (not of Camillus) requiring that, even in their emergency of danger, all legal formalities should be observed (see c. xlvi *ad med.*). Dante's language seems to imply a confused and inaccurate recollection of the passage in Livy. Dr. Schück[1] again suggests a possible reminiscence of Florus, but I can find nothing there so nearly resembling the passage in Dante as that which I have quoted from Livy. Moreover Dante expressly refers to Livy, and never mentions Florus, here or anywhere else. The same remarks apply to Eutropius, to whom Dr. Witte here refers[2].

(5)

Conv. III. xi. ll. 30 seqq. (quoting Liv. i. 18).

This is a quotation of some interest, (1) from the language with which Dante introduces it, viz. as being 'alluded to incidentally by Livy in the first part of his volume.' This is quite correct, since it is mentioned by Livy only in connexion with the alleged source of Numa Pompilius' excellent instruction on things human and divine. (2) Also because Dante ignores the fact that Livy goes on to point out that Numa could not really have owed anything to Pythagoras, since the latter lived more than a century later, in the reign of Servius Tullius. Yet Dante cites Livy's authority to prove that Pythagoras was a contemporary of Numa.

(6)

Par. viii. 131, 132. E vien Quirino
Da sì vil padre che si rende a Marte.

This is perhaps suggested to Dante by the tentative or alternative theory propounded by Livy, I. iv.: 'Vi compressa

[1] See *supra*, p. 274.

[2] The reference should be i. 20 (not i. 18, as in Dr. Witte).

Vestalis quum geminum partum edidisset, seu ita rata, seu quia deus auctor culpae honestior erat, Martem *incertae stirpis patrem* nuncupat.' Dante not only boldly adopts the latter alternative, but goes beyond it in asserting that the father was not only 'incerto' but 'vile.' Perhaps he may have been led to this by the language of Orosius, VI. i. § 5: 'Deus . . . quae infirma sunt mundi elegit, ut confundat fortia, Romanumque imperium *adsumpto pauperrimi status pastore* fundavit.'

(7)

Finally, in De Mon. II. ix. ll. 61–67, we have a statement attributed to Livy of a wholly apocryphal character, viz. that Alexander the Great, having summoned the Romans to submission, died suddenly in Egypt, before the return of his ambassadors. This seems to be partly inferred from the fact which Dante goes on to mention, on the authority of Lucan, viz. that 'his sepulchre is there with us unto this day.' See Phars. viii. 692 *seqq.* as quoted *h. l.* by Dante. It is evident, both from this passage and that in Inf. xiv. 31–36 (which however does not further concern us here, since no authority is there cited), that Dante was familiar with some traditional story or stories then current about Alexander[1], on which he relied. As to this particular story, see the suggestion already made *supra*, under Lucan, No. 9. The curious point here is the bold attribution to Livy of statements of which no trace is found in his works, especially when Livy himself expresses the belief that the Romans never even heard of Alexander: 'quem ne fama quidem illis notum arbitror fuisse' (ix. 18)[2]. This and other cases of ill-founded appeal to Livy by Dante, rather remind us of the banter of Phaedrus to Socrates, that it is very easy for him to allege an Egyptian origin to give an air of authority to his tales.

[1] There were several such. See a letter by myself to the *Academy*, Jan. 26, 1889, and one in the following week by Mr. Paget Toynbee.

[2] Pliny, Nat. Hist. III. v. § 9, says that Clitarchus mentions an embassy from the Romans to Alexander.

OROSIUS.

The subject of Dante's indebtedness to Orosius has been discussed by Mr. Paget Toynbee, with his usual learning and thoroughness, in *Romania* for July, 1895. His purpose is rather wider than that now before us, and most of what follows was written before I had the advantage of seeing that article. But it has enabled me to add some points, my indebtedness for which is duly acknowledged later. In the first place, Orosius was beyond doubt, directly or indirectly, the chief authority for the geographical theories, not only of Dante, but also of professed geographers and cartographers, during some centuries of the Middle Ages. He was in no sense an independent authority on this subject, and he did little more than condense and render easily accessible the teaching of Strabo. Though many centuries separated him from the time of Dante, the general knowledge on the subject of geography remained at much the same level. This is to a considerable degree accounted for by the fact that the principal features of the accepted geographical system were thought to be established beyond further question or inquiry by Scriptural or patristic authority.

There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that Orosius is the person referred to in Par. x. 119, 120, as

> Quell' avvocato dei tempi cristiani,
> Del cui latino Augustin si provvide.

See (*inter alia*) the reasons which I have given in discussing this passage in *Textual Criticism, &c.*, p. 457. Dante often lays stress in the Convito, the De Monarchia, and the Epistles[1] on the argument that Christ willed to be born at the time of the general peace established by Augustus, and to be enrolled as a Roman citizen (Luke ii. 1); thereby recognizing and ratifying the universal dominion of the Roman Emperor. This thought was no doubt derived from Orosius. See

[1] E.g. Conv. IV. 5, ll. 24 *seqq.* : De Mon. I. xvi. ll. 10 *seqq.*; II. ix. ll. 99 *seqq.*; II. xii. ll. 41–46 : Epist. VII. iii. *ad fin.*; VIII. ii. l. 23, &c.

Adv. Pag. VI. xxii. §§ 5–8 ('cuius [Urbis] potissime voluit esse cum venit, dicendus utique civis Romanus census professione Romani'), and many other passages[1]. So again, the idea that Titus was God's appointed instrument for avenging the death of Christ, repeated more than once by Dante, comes likewise from Orosius. See Purg. xxi. 82–4; Par. vi. 92, 3; and compare with this, Adv. Pag. VII. ix. § 8, 'pulchrum et ignotum antea cunctis mortalibus . . . hoc spectaculum fuit, patrem et filium uno triumphali curru vectos gloriosissimam ab his, qui Patrem et Filium offenderant, victoriam reportasse.' And again, VII. iii. § 8, 'extinctis Iudaeis Titus, qui ad vindicandum Domini Iesu Christi sanguinem judicio Dei fuerat ordinatus, victor triumphans cum Vespasiano patre Janum clausit.' But besides these and other instances of the borrowing by Dante of ideas and arguments from Orosius, there are several passages in which he directly quotes him, as well as others in which he is clearly indebted to him for historical information, and others again in which we suspect that, while mentioning Livy, he has at least supplemented him by a reference to Orosius. One certainly gains the general impression that he was really much more familiar with Orosius than with Livy. I have already noticed under Livy (No. 1) the probability of Dante having gathered from Orosius, IV. xvi. § 5, his information about Cannae, and the subsequent patriotic action of Scipio. Also under Livy, No. 3, the traces of the narrative of Orosius (II. xii. § 8) in Dante's account of Cincinnatus in De Mon. II. v. ll. 76 *seqq.* Again, Orosius, Adv. Pag. VI. i. § 5, has been referred to in Livy, No. 6.

The following further passages, among those indexed, seem to call for some special notice.

(1)

Adv. Pag. I. iv. §§ 4–8.

No one can doubt the direct imitation, almost amounting to actual quotation, of this passage in Inf. v. 52–59, respecting

[1] The idea and the argument are found repeatedly in Orosius, e. g. III. viii. §§ 7, 8; VI. xvii. § 10; VII. ii. § 16, iii. § 4, &c.

Ninus and Semiramis. The words speak for themselves. 'Huic (Nino) mortuo Semiramis uxor successit (confirming the certainly correct reading *succedette* in l. 59) . . . . Haec libidine ardens (l. 55) . . . privatam ignominiam publico scelere obtexit: praecepit enim ut inter parentes et filios nulla delata reverentia naturae de coniugiis adpetendis, ut cuique libitum esset liberum fieret (ll. 56, 57).' Though 'liberum' is the reading generally adopted, I find there was an old reading 'licitum,' which was probably that in the MS. used by Dante. One Bodleian MS. reads 'libero' for 'licito' at Inf. v. 56. This looks like a correction made by a scribe who had verified the reference.

It is to be observed that this same passage of Orosius is directly quoted by Dante in De Mon. II. ix. l. 25, when he states, on the authority of Orosius, that 'Ninus . . . cum consorte Semiramide,' endeavoured for ninety years and more to secure by conquest the sceptre of the world. It will be found that Orosius (*l. c.* § 1) assigns fifty years to the rule of Ninus, and forty-two (§ 4) to that of Semiramis. Hence Dante's expression, 'nonaginta et plures.'

(2)

Adv. Pag. VII. iii. § 1. Igitur ab urbe condita DCCLII natus est Christus . . .

The manner in which this date is referred to by Dante in Conv. III. xi. l. 24, may be compared with the passage last spoken of. He contents himself again with the round number, adding 'poco dal più al meno' to represent the 'two' in Orosius' figures. There is a more important point than this to notice. The MSS. (as far as they are reported) all appear to give '*seicento* cinquant' anni.' Now as Dante expressly cites Orosius as his authority, and the latter gives (without apparently any difference of reading) the correct number, I think it is most likely that some early copyist confused *setecento* with *seicento*, either as written in full, or perhaps more probably in Roman numerals, the error in either case being one easily made. It is curious that the same two numbers (in reference to an entirely different subject) are

interchanged in the MSS. at Conv. III. v. l. 88, where also *settecento* is the right number.

(3)

Par. vi. 58–72.

Mr. Toynbee has pointed out the interesting correspondence of the various exploits of Caesar enumerated here with a passage in Orosius vi. 15. The following list will show how closely Orosius is followed by Dante.

Par. vi. 59, 60.	Isara, Era, &c. . .	Orosius vi. 15, § 1 (rediens Caesar victor ex Gallia).
„ 61.	Ravenna	„ § 2.
„ 62.	Rubicon	„ § 3.
„ 64.	Spagna	„ § 6.
„ 65.	Durazzo	„ § 18.
„	Farsalia	„ § 25.
„ 66.	Nil	„ §§ 28, 29.
„ 67.	Antandro, &c. . . .	[not mentioned.]
„ 70.	Juba	„ 16, § 4.
„ 71.	Occidente	„ § 6 (in Hispanias profectus).

BOETHIUS.

A few words should be added respecting Boethius, or, as we are now entitled (since 1884) to call him, Saint Boethius[1]. He is one of Dante's most favourite authors. It was chiefly in his 'De Consolatione Philosophiae,' 'quello non conosciuto da molti libro,' that Dante found consolation after the death of Beatrice (Conv. II. xiii. l. 14), and it was also by this treatise and by Cicero, De Amicitia, that he was led on to the study of philosophy (Conv. II. xvi. ll. 4 *seqq.*). Boethius is very frequently quoted by Dante in his prose works, as will be seen from the Index. It will be sufficient here to call attention to a few probable citations or imitations in the Divina Commedia.

(1)

There is the celebrated passage in Inf. v. 121–123:

> Nessun maggior dolore,
> Che ricordarsi del tempo felice
> Nella miseria; e ciò sa il tuo dottore.

[1] See Hettinger (ed. Bowden), pp. 207 *n.*, 242 *n.*

These words seem to be an almost *verbatim* reproduction of a passage in Boethius: 'In omni adversitate fortunae, infelicissimum genus est infortunii fuisse felicem' (De Cons. Phil. II. Pros. iv). At the same time it is extremely doubtful whether Boethius would have been referred to (especially in language put into the mouth of Francesca) as 'il dottore' di Dante. This title would much more naturally belong to Virgil (the 'dottore' then present), though it is not easy to identify any passage corresponding to this in his works. Hence it has been suggested, but improbably enough, that it may merely refer to Virgil's personal experience of life. Possibly Dante may have had a general recollection of the sentiment, and may have wrongly attributed it to Virgil. The passage from Virgil, which is generally thought to be referred to, is Aen. ii. 3:

Infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem.

But the resemblance of this to the very definite sentiment here enunciated is surely very slight. Is it not perhaps possible that in consideration of the debt acknowledged to Boethius by Dante in the passage above quoted from the Convito (and especially Conv. II. xvi), that he may have here given to him this title of 'dottore,' which is usually, no doubt, reserved for Virgil? On the other hand, it must certainly be admitted that the next *terzina* seems to imply a reminiscence of the lines in Virgil immediately following:

Quis talia fando
. . . . . .
Temperet a lacrimis? . . . .
Sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros,
. . . . . .
Quamquam animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit,
Incipiam.

Moreover there are two other passages in the Inferno which closely remind us of this same place in Virgil, viz. i. 6 and xxxiii. 4–6.

It is difficult, therefore, to come to a very positive conclusion on this disputed point.

(2)

Next we have Purg. xxxiii. 112:

> Dinanzi ad esse Eufrates e Tigri
> Veder mi parve uscir d' una fontana,
> E quasi amici dipartirsi pigri.

This (as Scartazzini points out) is probably borrowed from Boethius, De Cons. Phil. V. Metr. i.:

> Tigris et Euphrates uno se fonte resolvunt,
> Et mox abiunctis dissociantur aquis.

The same notion is found, however, in Brunetto Latini, Tesoro, iii. 2, where it is advanced on the authority of Sallust. Brunetto, however, is undoubtedly borrowing direct from Isidore, Orig. xiii. 21: 'Sallustius auctor certissimus, asserit Tigrim et Euphratem uno fonte manare in Armenia, qui per diversa euntes longius dividantur,' &c.

(3)

We have already noted that the apparent citation from Juvenal in Conv. IV. xiii. l. 108, was probably filtered through Boethius. See under Juvenal, No. 4.

(4)

Scartazzini also points out that in Par. i. 74 the description of God as 'Amor che il ciel governi,' is borrowed directly from the phrase of Boethius, 'Coelo imperitans Amor' (De Cons. Phil. II. Metr. viii. l. 15).

In the following three or four well-known passages in the Commedia, the imitation or reminiscence of Boethius can scarcely be doubted.

(5)

The intervention of Beatrice with Virgil on behalf of Dante in Inf. ii. 76 *seqq.* closely resembles De Cons. Phil. I. Pros. iii, where, on Philosophy appearing to succour Boethius, he remonstrates: 'Quid tu in has exilii nostri solitudines, *o omnium magistra virtutum*, supero cardine delapsa venisti?' He further expresses surprise that she should incur the risk of sharing the slander and persecution by which he has been

ruined. This is precisely the attitude, *mutatis mutandis*, attributed to Virgil in reference to the descent of Beatrice. First notice the identical form of address, 'O donna di virtù' (l. 76). Next, the appeal in ll. 82 *seqq.*—

> Ma dimmi la cagion che non ti guardi
> Dello scender quaggiuso in questo centro
> Dall' ampio loco ove tornar tu ardi—

corresponds with 'supero cardine delapsa venisti.' Then follows the reason why Beatrice can thus descend without injury to herself, just as Philosophy offers a similar, though not identical, explanation in Boethius; the idea there being that she has often incurred such risks before, and ought not to shrink from sharing them again with one of her votaries. 'Atqui Philosophiae fas non erat incomitatum relinquere iter innocentis? Meam scilicet criminationem vererer? et, quasi novi aliquid acciderit, sic perhorrescerem,' &c.

(6)

Still more remarkable are the numerous points of imitation in the fine episode about Fortune in Inf. vii. This has obviously been suggested to Dante by De Cons. Phil. II. Metr. i. and Pros. ii, though I do not know that this has been specially noticed. We may note in particular the following points of comparison:—

> Non illa miseros audit, haud curat fletus;
> Ultroque gemitus dura quos fecit, ridet.
> Sic illa ludit, sic suas probat vires. (Met. i. ll. 5-7.)

Compare Inf. vii. ll. 94–6:

> Ma ella s' è beata, e ciò non ode:
> Con l' altre prime creature lieta
> Volve sua spera, e beata si gode.

Add Pros. ii, 'Haec nostra vis est, hunc continuum ludum ludimus. Rotam volubili orbe versamus, infima summis, summa infimis, mutare gaudemus'; and compare also Inf. vii. 79–84. So again in Pros. ii. (*init.*), Fortune is introduced remonstrating with Boethius as to the injustice of the complaints made against her for removing her favours, while no

gratitude is felt towards her for conferring them. Compare Inf. vii. 91–93:

> Quest' è colei ch' è tanto posta in croce
> Pur da color che le dovrian dar lode,
> Dandole biasmo a torto e mala voce.

Once more, compare with ll. 88–90,

> Le sue permutazion non hanno triegue:
> Necessità la fa esser veloce,
> Sì spesso vien chi vicenda consegue—

the following passages in Boethius: 'Tu vero volventis rotae impetum retinere conaris? At . . . si manere incipit, fors esse desistit' (Pros. i. *fin.*). 'Hi semper eius mores; haec natura est. Servavit circa te propriam potius in ipsa sui mutabilitate constantiam[1]' (Pros. i. *sub. med.*).

There is yet another passage in the same context, Met. ii. ll. 1–7, bearing a very close resemblance to Inf. vii. ll. 64–6, which can scarcely be accidental, especially as this very passage of Boethius is definitely cited by Dante in Conv. IV. xii. ll. 74–78:

> Si quantas rapidis flatibus incitus
> Pontus versat arenas,
> Aut quot stelliferis edita noctibus
> Coelo sidera fulgent,
> Tantas fundat opes, nec retrahat manum
> Pleno Copia cornu;
> Humanum miseras haud ideo genus
> Cesset flere querelas.

(7)

Purg. xxx. 73 seqq.

It is also, I think, clear that the scene of Dante's reproach by Beatrice, from Purg. xxx. 73 onwards, is suggested by De Cons. Phil. I. Pros. ii. (*init.*), although we do not trace any *verbatim* quotation. 'Tum vero totis in me intenta luminibus, Tune es ille, ait, qui nostro quondam lacte nutritus, nostris educatus alimentis, in virilis animi robur evaseras? Atqui talia contuleramus arma, quae nisi prius abiecisses, invicta te firmitate tuerentur. Agnoscisne me? Quid taces? pudore an

[1] Comp. with this Aristotle's expression in Poet. xv. § 4 ὁμαλῶς ἀνώμαλον.

stupore siluisti? mallem pudore; sed te, ut video, stupor oppressit. Cumque me non modo tacitum, sed elinguem prorsus mutumque vidisset, admovit pectori meo leniter manum, et, Nihil, inquit, periculi est,' &c. There is scarcely an idea here that has not its counterpart in the scene in Purg. xxix. and xxx.

(8)

The similarity of thought and expression in the following passages on the vanity of human fame can scarcely be accidental. Compare Purg. xi. 103–108 with De Cons. Phil. II. Pros. vii. (*sub med.*): 'Vos autem immortalitatem vobis propagare videmini, quum futuri famam temporis cogitatis. Quod si ad aeternitatis infinita spatia pertractes, quid habes quod de tui nominis diuturnitate laeteris? Unius enim mora momenti, si decem millibus conferatur annis, quoniam utrumque spatium definitum est, minimam licet, habet tamen aliquam portionem. At hic ipse numerus annorum, eiusque quantumlibet multiplex, ad interminabilem diuturnitatem ne comparari quidem potest,' &c.

(9)

In Conv. I. iii. ll. 32 *seqq.* Dante complains that he has been a wanderer in many lands, 'mostrando contro a mia voglia la piaga della fortuna, che suole ingiustamente al piagato molte volte essere imputata.' And again in Par. xvii. 52, 3, he declares:

> La colpa seguirà la parte offensa
> In grido, come suol.

These sentiments seem likely to have been suggested by De Cons. Phil. I. Pros. iv. (a chapter which is shown by the Index to have been very familiar to Dante): 'At vero hic etiam nostris malis cumulus accedit, quod existimatio plurimorum non rerum merita, sed fortunae spectat eventum. . . . Quo fit ut existimatio bona prima omnium deserat infelices. . . . Hoc tantum dixerim: ultimum esse adversae fortunae

sarcinam, quod dum miseris aliquod crimen affingitur, quae perferunt, meruisse creduntur,' &c.

The sentiment is not an uncommon one elsewhere. We may compare Ecclus. xiii. 27, 'Humilis deceptus est, insuper et arguitur; locutus est sensate, et non est datus ei locus.' Also Sallust, Jug. c. xxiv., 'expertus sum parum fidei miseris esse' (letter of Adherbal): and a Tuscan proverb quoted by Scartazzini, 'La colpa è sempre degli offesi.'

(10)

Lastly, the direct quotation of Boethius in Conv. III. ii. l. 144, seems to justify a slight rectification of the text. The words are, 'Tu e Dio, che te nella mente degli uomini mise.' Those of Boethius run: 'Tu mihi et qui te sapientium mentibus inseruit Deus,' &c. (De Cons. Phil. I. Pros. iv). As far as I am aware, the MSS. of Dante omit 'te.' But this evidently leaves the sense incomplete, and the word was probably accidentally dropped out by an early copyist. It will be observed that the correction is not made merely to secure greater exactness of quotation (which would be a very questionable step), but to complete a grammatically defective sentence.

SENECA.

In Conv. IV. xii. l. 120, Dante attributes a sentiment to Seneca, which, it is stated, and as far as I have been able to ascertain, truly, cannot be found in his works. The words are, 'Se l' uno de' piedi avessi nel sepolcro, apprendere vorrei.' In effect Seneca does say as much in Epist. 76: 'Tam diu discendum est, quam diu nescias, et, si proverbio credimus, quam diu vivas'; and again, 'Tamdiu discendum est quemadmodum vivas, quamdiu vivis.' But the particular metaphor of 'one foot in the grave' does not occur. We may perhaps suppose Dante to be referring to this passage, though the

actual metaphor is added by himself[1], it being one which was at any rate familiar to him, as we see from Purg. xviii. 121:

E tale ha già l' un piè dentro la fossa.

Another suggestion is made by Mazzuchelli, viz. that Dante may have somehow got hold of a sentiment precisely similar to the actual words quoted by him, which is ascribed to the great jurist Salvius Julianus (the author of the *edictum perpetuum*), who, being cited in the Digest, might thus be known to Dante, since he quotes this work under different titles (*Digesto*, *Inforziato*, *Ragione*) three or four times in the Convito and De Monarchia. The words are: 'Si alterum pedem in tumulo haberem, non pigeret aliquid addiscere.' This Dante may, by a slip of memory, have ascribed to Seneca; a mistake such as, alas! we are still liable to make, in spite of our enormous advantages in the way of printed editions, indices, and concordances.

In Conv. II. xiv. l. 174, Dante refers to a fiery meteor which Seneca says was seen in Rome at the time of the death of Augustus. This will be found in Nat. Quaest. I. i. and again VII. xvii. But we are bound to admit that Dante is not quoting here at first hand, for in Albertus Magnus, Meteor. I. iv. 9, the quotations here made by Dante from Albumassar and Seneca occur together almost *totidem verbis*[2].

Conv. IV. xii. l. 82. Quanto contra esse (ricchezze) Seneca, massimamente a Lucillo[3] scrivendo, &c.

There are several passages in Seneca's Epistles which may have been in Dante's mind, especially perhaps the following:—'Neminem pecunia divitem fecit: immo contra, nulli non maiorem sui cupiditatem incussit. Quaeris, quae sit huius

[1] We might perhaps make a similar suggestion in reference to the pseudo-Aristotelian quotation mentioned *supra*, p. 153. The sentiment is Aristotelian, though not the actual form of words. Compare, for example, Pol. I. xi. 6 (1258 b. 36): *τεχνικώτατοι μὲν τῶν ἐργασιῶν ὅπου ἐλάχιστον τῆς τύχης*. Magn. Mor. II. 8 (1207 a. 4, 5): *οὗ πλεῖστος νοῦς καὶ λόγος, ἐνταῦθα ἐλαχίστη τύχη· οὗ δὲ πλείστη τύχη, ἐνταῦθ' ἐλάχιστος νοῦς*, and other like passages.

[2] See *sup.* pp. 13, 129. [3] An error (Dante or copyists?) for *Lucilio*.

rei causa? plus incipit habere posse, qui plus habet.' Epist. cxix. (*ad med.*). 'Multis parasse divitias non finis miseriarum fuit, sed mutatio.' Epist. xvii. (*ad fin.*). 'Multum est non corrumpi divitiarum contubernio.' Epist. xx., &c.

An interesting reference, without, however, any definite quotation, is made to Seneca in Epist. iv. 5. Dante, exiled from Florence, begs his friend, an exile from Pistoja, to read the treatise of Seneca, *Fortuitorum Remedia*, as a defence against the darts of Fortune. This treatise [1] is now acknowledged to be the work of Martinus Dumiensis, Abbot of Dumio in Portugal, in the sixth century. (So also is the 'Liber de iv virtutibus,' which was likewise attributed formerly to Seneca, as by Dante himself in De Mon. II. v. l. 24.) It was originally printed among the works of Seneca; as in the old edition from which the following extracts are made, a black letter quarto in the Bodleian, 'Argentorati,' c. 1472. This Tractate professes to be addressed 'ad Gallionem amicum suum . . . contra omnes impetus et machinamenta fortunae.' The title is, 'Liber Senece de remediis fortuitorum.' It is in the form of a dialogue between Sensus (conquerens) and Ratio (confortans). The principal titles are as follows:— Mors, Egritudo, Maliloquium, Exilium, Dolor, Paupertas, Amissio pecuniae, Naufragium, Amissio amicorum, &c. Doubtless the portion chiefly in Dante's mind in the reference before us would be the section on 'Exilium,' the character of which may be judged from the following extracts, embodying probably the 'remedia,' which he thus recommends to his friend. 'Mundus omnium una patria est: extra hanc nemo proiici potest. . . . Non patria mihi interdicitur, sed locus. In quamcumque terram venio, in meam venio. Nulla terra exilium est, sed altera patria. . . . Patria est ubicunque bene es. Illud autem per quod bene est in homine non in loco est. . . . Si enim sapiens est peregrinatur . . . si stultus exulat,' &c.

[1] It was familiar to Brunetto Latini, and (as was his wont with other authors) freely copied by him.

ST. AUGUSTINE.

The direct references to St. Augustine in Dante are not so numerous as perhaps might have been expected [1]. When he appears among the saints specially pointed out in the Heavenly Rose in Par. xxxii., he seems to be selected rather from his traditional connexion with the great monastic order of Augustinians, and with hermits and solitaries in particular [2], than for his eminence as a theologian. This appears from his association with St. Francis and St. Benedict, as the three saints in closest proximity to St. John the Baptist. He is quoted three times in one chapter of the De Monarchia, viz. III. iv.; the first quotation (ll. 51 *seqq.*) is a striking passage from De Civ. Dei, XVI. ii., protesting against the over-interpretation of parable and allegory, and enforcing the point by the excellent illustration of the plough, all the parts of which are necessary, though the share only cleaves the ground. The other two passages come from the same context in the De Doctrina Christiana (I. xxxvi. and xxxvii.), the only point calling for remark being the curious reading (l. 65), 'eo tamen per *gyrum* pergeret quo via illa perducit,' where our MSS. of St. Augustine (in c. xxxvi) read *agrum*. Dr. Witte supposes that Dante had an inferior text. (We may compare with this passage, Convito IV. xii. l. 181 *seqq.*)

St. Augustine is also directly quoted three times in the Convito. In two of these cases it will be seen that I have failed to identify the passage. In the third case, Conv. I. iv. l. 67, St. Augustine is quoted as saying, 'Nullo è senza macola.' I have not found the precise words, though they are likely enough to occur in St. Augustine, since the sentiment would be a common one in his writings. The passage I have noted

[1] See, however, *infra*, p. 294.

[2] In 1284, and therefore within Dante's recollection, about forty years after the foundation of the Franciscan and Dominican orders, Innocent IV had with some difficulty brought all hermits and solitaries under the Augustinian rule. See Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Monastic Orders*.

from the Conf. I. vii. (among others) would at any rate fully justify the paraphrase, if such it be, 'Nemo mundus a peccato coram te.' Dante shows his acquaintance with the general subject matter of the Confessions by his language in I. ii. l. 104, though no definite passage is there quoted. He is here excusing himself for speaking so much about himself in the Convito, by the example of St. Augustine in his Confessions. So also in Epist. x. 28, Dante refers to the contents of the treatise 'De Quantitate Animae.' Again, the well-known line in Purg. xxv. 83:

Memoria, intelligenza, e volontade,

seems suggested by St. Augustine, De Trin. x. 17, 18, where these three words united occur more than once, though not in connexion with the statement here made by Dante, but as illustrating by their union in 'una vita . . . una mens,' the mystery of the Trinity in Unity. It has been usual to suppose that the collocation of the Virgin and Eve in Paradise, and in particular the language in which it is described, viz.:

La piaga che Maria richiuse ed unse,
Quella ch' è tanto bella da' suoi piedi
È colei che l' aperse e che la punse (Par. xxxii. 4-6)—

was suggested to Dante by St. Augustine. This contrast between Eve and the Blessed Virgin is found several times in his writings. In the two passages entered in the Index a string of antitheses is summed up with the words, 'percussit illa, ista sanavit,' which closely resemble the above language of Dante. Pietro di Dante observes that in order to signify this contrast she was addressed *Ave*, which is *Eva* reversed!

In his Epistle to the Cardinals, Ep. viii. § 7, Dante deplores that the study of St. Augustine, together with Gregory, Ambrose, and others, had been displaced by that of the Decretals and similar works. This passage should be compared with the fierce outbreak in Par. ix. 133 *seqq.*

In Par. xxiv. 106–8, Dante in answer to St. Peter gives as one at least of his reasons for believing in the miracles of the

New Testament, that if the world had been converted to Christianity without miracles, this alone would have been a miracle a hundred times greater than all the others. This idea is no doubt borrowed from St. Augustine, De Civ. Dei, XXII. v. *fin.*: 'Si vero per Apostolos Christi, ut eis crederetur resurrectionem atque ascensionem praedicantibus Christi, etiam ista miracula facta esse non credunt, hoc nobis unum grande miraculum sufficit, quod eam terrarum orbis sine ullis miraculis credidit.' The same thought is repeated in a slightly different form a little later, in c. viii. *init.*: 'Possem quidem dicere necessaria fuisse (*sc.* miracula), prius quam crederet mundus, ad hoc ut crederet mundus. Quisquis adhuc prodigia ut credat inquirit, magnum est ipse prodigium, qui mundo credente non credit.'

In Conv. III. xi. ll. 35 *seqq.*, it appears as if the list of the seven sages of Greece was derived from St. Augustine, De Civ. Dei, XVIII. xxv. The Pythagorean origin of the term 'philosopher' may have been derived from the same source, supplemented perhaps by VIII. ii. of the same work. [This was also pointed out by Mr. Paget Toynbee in *Romania* for July, 1895.]

There can be no doubt (as has already been sufficiently explained, *supra*, p. 188), that De Civ. Dei, V. xviii. has formed the model for two chapters in Dante which much resemble one another, viz. Conv. IV. v. and De Mon. II. v.

Purg. xxii. 67–69. Facesti come quei che va di notte,
Che porta il lume retro, e sè non giova,
Ma dopo sè fa le persone dotte.

This beautiful and pathetic comparison to describe the Christian enlightenment said to have been derived by Statius from Virgil, who yet did not profit by it himself, has been referred with some probability by Scartazzini to the following passage from St. Augustine, Conf. IV. xvi.: 'Dorsum enim habebam ad lumen, et ad ea quae illuminantur faciem; unde ipsa facies mea, qua illuminata cernebam, non illuminabatur.' We might compare for the metaphor, though rather by way of contrast in the sentiment, the lines of Ennius quoted by

Cicero, De Off. I. xvi. § 51 (a chapter certainly familiar to Dante):

> Homo, qui erranti comiter monstrat viam,
> Quasi lumen de suo lumine accendat facit:
> Nihilominus ipsi lucet, quum illi accenderit.

The idea here is rather that of Purg. xv. 55 *seqq.*, with which we might again compare Cicero, de Amic. xix. § 70 *fin.*: 'Fructus enim ingenii et virtutis omnisque praestantiae tum maximus capitur, quum in proximum quemque confertur.'

Other passages, in which we may suspect that Dante was under the influence of St. Augustine in his interpretation of Scripture, will be found noticed *supra*, under Vulgate, Nos. 38, 45, 46.

I must confess, in conclusion, that I have not been able as yet to investigate the question of Dante's probable acquaintance with the works of St. Augustine nearly as fully as the subject seems to deserve. I am continually coming on fresh points of resemblance. There is, however, always this element of uncertainty, that many of his theories or arguments are reproduced by Aquinas, who would be for Dante a 'proprior interpres' (to borrow a phrase of Livy).

MINOR AUTHORS.

1. AESOP.

Dante twice quotes Fables of Aesop. In the Convito IV. xxx. l. 40 there is no difficulty, since the well-known first fable is at once recognized. But in Inf. xxiii. 4 a fable is referred to which is not found in the collection. Two explanations are suggested by Scartazzini, *h. l.* (1) That it occurs in a Life of Aesop written by a Greek monk, Planudes Maximus, in the fourteenth century. He appears to have died fully twenty years later than Dante, but it is not impossible, unless this Life were written by him in his later years, that Dante may have seen it. (2) Benvenuto mentions

that a Latin version of *excerpta* from Aesop contained this fable: 'Aesopus . . . Graece scripsit magnum opus, ex quo defloratus fuit *iste parvus libellus quo Latini utuntur*,' &c. This is interesting because it suggests a possible similar source for several other quotations by Dante, especially some of those which are difficult to identify in the authors cited. There must have been many 'libelli' of *excerpta*, or 'elegant extracts' 'in usum scholarum,' which are now lost. (See further on this *supra*, p. 14.)

2. LUCRETIUS.

This poet is never, I believe, mentioned or referred to by Dante, though we might have expected so distinguished an example of one 'che il mondo a caso pone,' to have been found among those enumerated in Inf. iv. *sub fin.* Dean Plumptre (vol. ii. p. 26) remarks that there is no trace of Dante's having known Lucretius[1]. Mr. Butler, indeed, has pointed out a remarkable resemblance between the language of Dante, Par. xiv. 112 *seqq.*—

> Così si veggion qui diritte e torte,
> Veloci e tarde, rinnovando vista,
> Le minuzie dei corpi lunghe e corte
> Moversi per lo raggio, onde si lista
> Tal volta l' ombra, &c.—

with that of Lucretius ii. 115, 6—

> Multa minuta modis multis per inane videbis
> Corpora misceri radiorum lumine in ipso.

At any rate, even if the passage of Lucretius be copied here (which seems to me very doubtful), it was probably found by Dante as quoted by some other author, or else it may be in some of the *Florilegia*, though the former would here seem the more probable supposition, if any is needed.

[1] Lucretius however is said by Jourdain (Traductions d'Aristote, p. 21) to be one of those authors who was read at all periods of the Middle Ages.

3. VALERIUS MAXIMUS.

Valerius Maximus[1] is nowhere mentioned or directly quoted by Dante. In the two or three following cases one suspects that he may perhaps have drawn the historical examples or allusions from this source, chiefly because one is unable to suggest any other more likely, but our knowledge of the handbooks, epitomes, Florilegia, &c., that may have been in use in Dante's time is so slight, that references of this kind can only be conjecturally suggested as *prima facie* probable. Of course it will be observed that the instances which follow are introduced in the Purgatorio in such a manner that their source would not in any case be acknowledged, any more than the other very numerous examples which are obviously derived from Ovid, Virgil, &c. The reference in Purg. xxii. 145 (the ancient Roman matrons being content to drink water only) may have come either from Valerius Maximus directly, or even more probably perhaps secondhand from his citation to this effect by St. Thomas Aquinas, Summa II. 2^{dae} Q. 149, Art. 4 (as suggested by Scartazzini, *h. l.*). In Purg. xv. 94, the story of Pisistratus and his daughter, which Dante relates at unusual length, seems very likely to have been copied from a similar narrative in Val. Max. V. i. Ext. 2, by whom it is given as an example of 'Humanitas et Clementia.' In the case of Purg. xxix. 116, describing the gorgeous triumphal car of Scipio Africanus, I can only say that some description of it is to be read in Val. Max. IV. i. 6, and that I have not been able to find one anywhere else.

Since writing the note on Phalaris and Perillus in connexion with a passage in Ovid (*supra*, p. 215), my attention has been directed to a passage in Valerius Maximus which seems to present some correspondences in detail with the language of Dante. In IX. ii. Ext. 9, we read: 'Saevus etiam ille aenei tauri inventor, quo inclusi subditis ignibus longo et abdito cruciatu *mugitus resonantem spiritum edere cogebantur, ne*

[1] The chief commentator on Dante, Benvenuto da Imola, wrote also a commentary on Valerius Maximus.

eiulatus eorum humanae sono vocis expressi Phalaridis tyranni misericordiam implorare possent: quam quia calamitosis deesse voluit, taeterrimum artis suae opus *primus* inclusus *merito* auspicatus est.' The first words in italics resemble the idea expressed by Dante in ll. 10–12, that idea being a little out of the common. The sentiment of the last words, and that of Dante in ll. 7–9, is more obvious.

4. GALEN.

Dante once quotes Galen (De Mon. I. xiii. l. 45) to show that no knowledge at all is better than false knowledge (if the expression can be used), since the process of unlearning and then learning, which the latter case involves, demands twice as much time. This passage occurs in the short treatise 'De cognoscendis curandisque animi morbis,' c. x. *ad fin.* (vol. v. p. 56, Ed. Lips., 1823). Dante obtained it either from a Latin version or more probably from a Florilegium, where it would be likely enough to occur. It will be observed that he gives no definite reference, as he usually does when he knows the source of a quotation. Also in Conv. I. viii. l. 33, he mentions a work described as 'li Tegni di Galieno,' i.e. Τέχναι[1]. Galen is also honoured with a place in the Inferno, or rather Limbo, in very distinguished company (Inf. iv. 143).

5. VEGETIUS.

Dante once quotes Vegetius, but it is not unlikely that this quotation (the only reference to him) is secondhand, for the context does not bear out the application made of the passage by Dante. The passage occurs in De Mon. II. x. ll. 18 *seqq.*: 'Semper cavendum est, ut quemadmodum in rebus bellicis prius omnia tentanda sunt per disceptationem quamdam, et ultimum per proelium dimicandum est, ut Tullius et Vegetius concorditer praecipiunt, hic in Re militari,

[1] This is the form into which the title of this work is commonly transliterated in mediaeval writers; and the 'Liber Tegni' formed part of the curriculum of study at Bologna and Paris. (See Rashdall, *Universities of Europe*, &c., vol. i. pp. 247, 429.)

ille vero in Officiis.' Cicero *l. c.* is in fact arguing for employing what we should now call arbitration (*disceptatio*) whenever possible, in preference to making an appeal to arms, in exact accordance with Dante's declaration here. But Vegetius (III. c. ix.) is enforcing the necessity for a prudent general having recourse to ambush, scouting operations, and other manœuvres, before engaging in open battle. The chapter is headed 'utrum superventibus et insidiis an publico debeat Marte confligi'; and he says—'Boni enim duces non aperto Marte proelium in quo est commune periculum, sed ex occulto semper attentant.' The quotation, therefore, was not strictly applicable to Dante's purpose.

CONCLUSION.

I must now bring these prolonged discussions to a close. I conclude as I began, by expressing my amazement at the variety and extent of Dante's learning. The labour of following in his tracks, even to the extent which I have been able to do it, has often been very considerable. No doubt the Middle Ages furnish many other examples of such prodigies of industry. But they occur among professed students and teachers, and it would be difficult, I imagine, to find a parallel to the literary activity and extensive reading of Dante in any life of such perpetual distractions and unrest. The field of his wide and varied erudition is by no means exhausted by the list of authors with which I have been dealing. But I have already gone somewhat beyond the limits of 'Scriptural and Classical authors' in one or two cases; and, if the door were opened more widely, one must admit, above all, Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, as well as Bonaventura, Richard and Hugh of St. Victor, perhaps Peter Lombard, and certainly the Arabian Alfraganus, epitomizer of Ptolemy, and Dante's own master, Brunetto Latini. Some of these, and especially the two first mentioned, would add enormously

to the length of this Essay, and would open up a considerable field of additional research. I am especially sorry to omit Alfraganus, to whom Dante is certainly and very largely indebted for the numerous astronomical details to be found in his works[1]. I hope, however, that I may some day have the opportunity of dealing with this subject in another essay, introductory to the Astronomy of Dante. I trust I may thus be able to throw some light on numerous passages by which I know many readers are too easily repelled, without even making an effort to understand them. Most of these passages are perfectly clear and quite easily intelligible, with a very moderate acquaintance with the rudiments of astronomical knowledge, particularly as it is embodied in the Ptolemaic system current in the time of Dante. This, with many other subjects which tempt me on, must be abandoned for the present, in the hope however that I may some day return to them, and that, in spite of the ever-increasing burden of other duties and preoccupations, the proverbial 'more convenient season' may not refuse to present itself.

[1] Some account of Alfraganus will be found in the article in *Romania*, already quoted *supra*, p. 293.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

P. 124 (to add to No. 33).

This distinction between *aer* and *aether* is repeated by St. Augustine, e.g. De Civ. Dei, VIII. xxi.: '. . . quod scilicet deos *aetherios* humana curantes quid terrestres homines agerent utique lateret, nisi daemones *aerii* nuntiarent; quoniam *aether* longe a terra est alteque suspensus, *aer* vero aetheri terraeque contiguus.' And again, *ib.* IV. x., 'Quia Iovem, inquiunt, in *aethere* accipimus, in *aere* Iunonem.' Another passage, more closely resembling that quoted *l. c.* from the Quaestio, occurs in the Imperf. Lib. de Genesi, § 14, '*Aer* quidem mobilior est quam aqua; *aether* autem mobilior ipso aere non absurde creditur.' Also in the curious 'Book of the Secrets of Enoch' (lately published by Messrs. Morfill and Charles), p. 4, we read that Enoch in his ascent was first placed on the clouds, then going higher he saw the air, and going still higher he saw the aether, and so arrived at the first heaven.

P. 134, Insert (45 *a*).

Purg. v. 115–118. Indi la valle, come il dì fu spento,
Da Pratomagno al gran giogo coperse
Di nebbia, e il ciel di sopra fece intento
Sì, che il pregno aere in acqua si converse.

The passages quoted under Aristotle, Nos. 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, from the Meteorologica (besides others that might be added), throw light upon a question of interpretation in the above passage, and, as I think, determine the right meaning to be assigned to *intento*. Some old commentators paraphrase it by 'disposto.' Others, who are followed by most modern commentators and translators, consider it as equiva-

lent to 'overcast.' (Compare '*obtenta* densantur nocte tenebrae,' Virg. Geor. i. 248.) The true meaning, as suggested by the Aristotelian theory (for which see references, *supra*), is that the demon produced such *tension* in the clouds of the cold upper regions of the air that they *burst* into torrents of rain. (Note the expression 'pregno aere' in l. 118.) It will be remembered that Aristotle regarded wind, meteors, lightning and rain as all due to the same cause, viz. the extrusion of the contents of clouds when the tension or density produced by cold became too great for them to be held by the clouds, or in the form of vapour. Compare here Purg. xxxii. 109–111; and Par. xxiii. 40–42. One passage in particular from Aristotle, Meteorologica, may be added to those above mentioned, viz. II. iv. (360 b. 32 to 361 a. 3). After stating that the escape of heat into the upper region of the air, and the consequent increase of cold in the clouds, condenses their vapour into water, Aristotle proceeds—*καὶ ὅταν εἰς ταὐτὸν συνωσθῶσι τὰ νέφη καὶ ἀντιπεριστῇ εἰς αὐτὰ ἡ ψῦξις, ὕδωρ γίγνεται.* The two graphic verbs here employed illustrate the 'tension' or 'constraint' implied by Dante's word *intento*. It was, moreover, a common and familiar notion that fine weather occurred when the atmosphere was, so to speak, 'at ease,' without any irregular pressure or constraint anywhere; e.g. St. Augustine, de Gen. ad literam, III. § 14, 'aer *contractus* nubila, *conspissatus* pluviam . . . *distentus* serenum.' [Note that he is speaking of the *aer* as occupied and indeed 'administered' by the fallen angels.] Compare also, Hor. Epod. xiii. 1: 'Horrida tempestas caelum *contraxit*[1];' and contrast with this Lucr. i. 9: 'Placatumque nitet *diffuso* lumine caelum.' Again, Virgil describing the alternations of bad and good weather says:—

> Juppiter uvidus Austris
> Densat, erant quae rara modo, et quae densa relaxat.
> (Georg. i. 418, 9.)

I think then that this is a case in which the classical authorities of Dante help us in the matter of *interpretation*;

[1] I believe other explanations of this word are given.

and I should have introduced it among the passages of Aristotle cited above, had I noticed it in time.

P. 217, Insert (**12** *a*).

The Spear of Achilles.

Inf. xxxi. 4-6. Così od' io che soleva la lancia
D' Achille e del suo padre esser cagione
Prima di trista e poi di buona mancia.

A question has been raised as to the source of Dante's statement that the spear possessing the power to heal as well as to wound belonged to the father of Achilles in the first instance. This appears, it is true, in Homer[1], but not, as far as I can ascertain, in any *Latin* authority, such as Dante can have had access to, e.g. Virgil, Ovid, the notes of Servius, or the Trojan history of Dictys and Dares, &c. There may have been, doubtless, other channels through which the Homeric tradition may have flowed. But as Dante seems to have had in his mind here a passage in Ovid, Rem. Amor. ll. 47, 48 :

Vulnus in Herculeo quae quondam fecerat hoste,
Vulneris auxilium Pelias hasta tulit—

I think it is at least possible that he may have misunderstood, or perhaps imperfectly recollected, the expression ' Pelias hasta ' which occurs here, and also elsewhere in Ovid.

The following points may be noted :

(1) This passage of the Rem. Amor. is not unlikely to have been known to Dante, since he quotes l. 2 of the same book in Vita Nuova, § 25.

(2) These lines are in fact quoted in illustration of this passage of Dante in the commentary of Pietro.

(3) The allusion in Metam. xiii. 171, 2 to this same legend is much less direct[2], and could hardly have suggested such language as—

Così od' io che soleva la lancia, &c.,

as the lines quoted from Rem. Amor. might well have done.

[1] Πηλιάδα μελίην, τὴν πατρὶ φίλῳ πόρε Χείρων
Πηλίου ἐκ κορυφῆς, φόνον ἔμμεναι ἡρώεσσιν. Il. xvi. 143-4.

[2] It is indeed curiously indirect. One has to read a large amount of context to discover that in the lines

Ego Telephon hasta
Pugnantem domui : victum orantemque refeci—

(4) Dante expressly mentions that Peleus was the father of Achilles in Conv. IV. xxvii. *fin.*

I have suggested a possible misunderstanding by Dante of the authorities quoted in some other cases, e.g. *supra*, pp. 186, 7.

Mr. W. P. Ker has kindly sent me the following interesting extract from Bernard de Ventadour (twelfth century), which shows that somehow the association of Peleus with the spear of Achilles was known in the Middle Ages:

Ja sa bella boca rizens
No cugei baizan me trays,
Mas ab un dous baizar m'aucis;
E s'ab autre no m'es guirens
  Atressi m'es per semblansa
  Cum fo de Peleus la lansa,
Que de son colp non podi' hom guerir
Si per eys loc no s'en fezes ferir[1].

I did not think her smiling mouth would betray me in a kiss, but with a sweet kiss she slew me; and if with another (kiss) she be not my surety, it is with me after the likeness of the spear of Peleus; for of its stroke might no man recover, unless he caused himself to be struck by it in the same place.

P. 228 (to add to note 1).

I am indebted to Mr. Paget Toynbee for the following illustrations in addition to those given *supra*, p. 228, on the mediaeval conception of Lucan as a historian rather than a poet. Chaucer couples Lucan with Suetonius and Valerius Maximus, Monke's Tale, 729, 30; and in the House of Fame (iii. 407 *seqq.*) places him among

Alle these clerkes
That writen of Romes mighty werkes[2].

the speaker is Ulysses, who, in order to obtain the arms of Achilles, claims the credit of this and other achievements of Achilles, on the ground that it was he who discovered Achilles when disguised, and was the means of his coming to Troy at all. See the preceding words: 'Ergo opera illius mea sunt!' There is one more allusion in Ovid, but also a very indirect one, 'opusque meae *bis* sensit Telephus hastae,' in Met. xii. 112.

[1] Raynouard, *Poésies des Troubadours*, iii. p. 43.

[2] Chaucer's list here (ll. 339 *seqq.*) is a curious one, and may be compared with that given *supra*, p. 6 *n.* It is:—1. Josephus; 2. Statius ('The Tholosan

There is also a long French metrical poem, the Roman de Jules César, by Jacot de Forest (latter half of thirteenth century), which is largely based upon the Pharsalia: one of the rubrics is—'Ci commence l'istoire après Lucain.' Also a MS. of a Roman History in the Bibl. Nat. at Paris is entitled—'Li fés (=faits) des Romains compilés ensemble de Saluste, de Suétone, et de Lucan.'

The following illustrations (also communicated by Mr. Toynbee) will speak for themselves without further comment in connexion with the references given.

PP. 173–175 (The fable of Manto).

'Manto Tiresiae filia post interitum Thebanorum dicitur delata in Italiam Mantuam condidisse.' (Isidore, Origines, xv. i. 59.)

P. 232.

Compare with Conv. IV. xxviii. ll. 121 *seqq.* (quoted *supra*, p. 232 *med.*) the following from Seneca, Controv., Lib. I (*sub init.*): 'Et quem tandem antistitem sanctiorem invenire sibi divinitas potuit, quam Catonem, per quem humano generi non praeciperet sed convicium faceret[1]?'

P. 256.

The line from Juvenal,

Nobilitas [animi] sola est et unica virtus,

is quoted in this form in the Moralium Dogma attributed to Gautier de Lille, a work of which Brunetto Latini made use.

that highte Stace.' Comp. with this, Purg. xxi. 89); 3. Homer, and other writers about Troy; 4. Virgil; 5. Ovid ('Venus' clerk'); 6. Lucan, &c. (as *supra*); 7. Claudian.

[1] iii. p. 66, Ed. Elzevir, 1672.

ON THE TRANSLATIONS OF ARISTOTLE USED BY DANTE.

That Dante as a matter of fact was dependent on Latin translations of Aristotle scarcely needs any proof or argument. In one passage at least he almost says as much himself; in other places in which he has occasion to speak of one or two Greek words he convinces us that the original would not have been of much use to him if he had had access to it. The first passage referred to is in Conv. II. xv, where, after giving various opinions as to the nature of the Milky Way (or 'Via di San Jacopo'), he confesses himself unable to state the opinion of Aristotle, 'perchè la sua sentenza non si trova cotale nell' una traslazione come nell' altra.' He then quotes the opinions found in the 'New' and 'Old' Translations respectively (a subject to which we shall return later). As to the passages in which occasional Greek words are introduced, they are in some cases copied from earlier authors, such as Isidore, or Uguccione da Pisa, and in others they tend rather to prove ignorance than knowledge of Greek on the part of Dante himself. Without pursuing this subject further we may mention two cases. In Conv. IV. xxi. l. 120, we find, 'si è *l' appetito dell' Animo*, il quale in Greco è chiamato '*hormen*:' and again in the following chapter (l. 34), 'nasce un rampollo, che gli Greci chiamano *hormen*, cioè, *appetito d' animo* naturale.' This seems to imply ignorance of the simplest inflexions of Greek, since *hormen* = ὁρμήν is treated as if it were a nominative. There is another passage of the same kind in Conv. IV. vi. l. 40, where Dante (following and quoting Uguccione[1]) says that one of the derivations of *Autore*

[1] I do not find that Uguccione states that *Autentin* is a Greek word, though he explains it, 'id est auctoritatem.'

is 'uno vocabolo greco che dice *Autentin*, che tanto vale in Latino, quanto *degno di fede e d' obbedienza*.' Here αὐθέντην seems to be treated as a nominative case: and so also apparently is *Antictona* ('Αντίχθονα) in Conv. III. v. l. 32. As to the curious word 'entomata' for 'insects' in Purg. x. 128, it has been ingeniously suggested that Dante perhaps found ἔντομα, τά in a vocabulary, and may have run the two words together[1]. It may be added that Boccaccio, Gen. Deorum, XV. c. 7, makes the astonishing statement that no one in Italy knew even the Greek characters! This must be an absurd exaggeration, for Greek was known and studied at Monte Cassino. The Dominicans were in fact ordered to study Hebrew, Arabic, and Greek. Moreover, in several cities of South Italy Greek was still a living language[2].

There are two other passages relating to translations of Greek authors which we may quote before proceeding. In Conv. I. x. ll. 65 *seqq.* Dante gives, as one of his reasons for writing the Convito in Italian rather than Latin, the fear that some incompetent person might seize on him, and spoil him by translation, 'l'avesse laido fatto parere, come fece quelli che trasmutò il Latino dell' *Etica*.' This is supposed to refer to Taddeo d'Alderotto[3], who is probably the person alluded to with a sneer in Par. xii. 83:

> Non per lo mondo, per cui mo s' affanna
> Diretro ad Ostiense ed a Taddeo.

The other passage is that often referred to in Conv. I. vii. l. 96, where Dante says that Homer has never been translated, and

[1] There is a curious tradition that Dante supported himself for a time by keeping a school at Gubbio, and that he had some pupils in Greek (see my 'Dante and his Early Biographers,' p. 89). It seems certain that if he knew it, he did not, or could not (like the πολιτικοί as described by Plato and Aristotle), impart that knowledge to his own son Pietro, who, among other escapades in the field of etymology, derives Hypocrite from *epi*, quod est *supra*, et *crisis*, *aurum*, and hence they wore gilded hoods in Inf. xxiii!

[2] See Palermo, *San Tommaso, Aristotele, e Dante*, p. 16 *fin.*

[3] This Taddeo, or Thaddeus, of Florence was a celebrated physician, who is reputed to have been the founder of a scientific school of medicine at Bologna, *c.* 1260. For some curious details about him, see Rashdall's Universities of Europe, vol. i. p. 236. It is said (see Giuliani's note, *h. l.*) that Brunetto Latini, when embodying portions of the Ethics in his Tesoro, translated into French Taddeo's Italian translation of the Latin version of the Greek original. Even

that he, and indeed any other poet, is incapable of translation, as the poetry would thus be lost; and he adds an illustration (the force of which we can appreciate) from the ruinous effect produced upon the Psalms by such a process.

The subject of the early translations of Aristotle is an extremely obscure one. I do not profess to have made any special study of it myself, my purpose not going beyond the search for some light as to the translation probably used by Dante. The chief authority on the subject is still, I believe, Jourdain, *Recherches Critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote*. In the details which follow I am indebted almost entirely to that work, and my references are made to the second edition, Paris, 1843.

First of all it is to be observed that the early translations of Aristotle fall into two families or classes, (1) those made from Arabic versions, and (2) those made direct from the Greek. Without going back further than is necessary for the special aspect of the question with which we are concerned, we may note that the encouragement of letters by Frederic II and Manfred, and especially by the former, gave a great stimulus to the knowledge of the works of Aristotle, and of Arabian philosophers and astronomers in Italy and elsewhere early in the thirteenth century. This was in fact the main cause of the introduction into Western Europe of what is known as 'the new Aristotle.' In the earlier centuries the knowledge of Aristotle was limited to a few of his Logical works in translations or commentaries. From this time he became an authority also on Ethics, Physics, Metaphysics, &c. A celebrated letter of Frederic is still extant (see Jourdain, p. 156 *seqq.*), in which he speaks of the treasures of ancient literature in his library ('quorum . . . chirographa nostrarum armaria divitiarum locupletant'), and in particular how 'compilationes variae quae ab Aristotele aliisque philosophis sub Graecis Arabicisque vocabulis antiquitus editae in sermonialibus et mathematicis disciplinis' still remain veiled

that Latin, as we shall see later, was probably taken from an Arabic or Hebrew translation of the Greek! And in some cases a Syriac version intervened between even the Arabic and the original (Rashdall, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 351 and 360 *n.*). After all these transmutations, 'quot libras in duce summo invenies?'

in the obscurity of their original language, and have not yet been made known by a Latin translation ('vel hominis defectus aut operis ad Latinae linguae notitiam non perduxit'). He orders therefore, with a view to their general utility, that learned men 'in utriusque linguae prolatione peritos' should faithfully render these works into Latin, &c. This passage is quoted partly in the original Latin that readers may observe the exact words employed by Frederic, since on the strength of this letter he has been credited with ordering and procuring (1) a complete translation of all the works of Aristotle; and (2) one based on both the Greek and Arabic versions. I do not propose to enter into the dispute as to how far Frederic's noble purpose (for so, even without any of the later exaggerations of its magnitude, it certainly was) was carried out. We need only observe that the language of the letter itself does not imply so large or complete a design, nor is there historical evidence that it was ever accomplished. This much however may be safely asserted. Michael Scot, who was in high favour at the court of Frederic II, both as a scholar and as an astrologer (in which latter capacity he has earned a place in the Inferno of Dante, xx. 116[1]), certainly made a Latin version of several of the works of Aristotle from the Arabic, though it may be suspected in some cases that it was rather the paraphrase of them by Averroes that formed the basis of his work (Jourdain, pp. 128, 9). Further, it is certain that Albertus Magnus availed himself of this very translation in the case of some of the works of Aristotle (e. g. Hist. Anim., Jourdain, pp. 325 *seqq.*, and especially p. 349), and of some Arabo-Latin translation in others (e. g. De Coelo, Meteor., &c., pp. 37, 316), while in others again he employed a Latin translation direct from the Greek (e. g. Physics, De Anima, Metaphysics, Ethics, Politics, pp. 310, 319, 352, 354, 357). Also in a passage quoted later (p. 315 *n.*) he speaks of consulting translations of both kinds.

[1] What does Dante mean by describing him as 'ne' fianchi così poco,' in l. 115? Some old commentators comically suppose the reference to be to his Scotch dress! It is perhaps only a curious coincidence that Sir W. Scott describes the otherwise brawny figure of Cristal Nixon in Redgauntlet as 'broad-shouldered, square-made, *thin-flanked*.'

Besides the translations from the Arabic of Michael Scot, some are assigned to Hermann Alemannus, whose personality has been confused with others of the same name but very different dates (Jourdain, p. 142). In particular the Ethics, Rhetoric, and Poetics [1] (pp. 139, 141, 143, 144) were translated by him (*c.* 1240); and it is further stated that he employed Saracens and not, as other translators, Jews, to assist him in his work. If Buhle is correct, these Arabic versions themselves were not always direct from the Greek, and he goes so far as to assert that the earliest Latin versions were based on a *Hebrew* translation (combined with the comments of Averroes) of an *Arabic* translation made by Averroes [2] from a *Syriac* version of the Greek original. The result of such a '*τρίτον γέννημα ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως*' was no doubt '*πόρρω που τῆς ἀληθείας*.'

Let us turn now to the Latin versions made directly from the Greek, the origin of some of which is enveloped in even greater obscurity than those of the former class. The oldest versions are attributed to Boethius or Boetius [3]. Albertus Magnus is said to have used a 'Versio Boetiana,' and St. Thomas Aquinas acknowledges obligations to him. Naturally all these works have gravitated to the great author who bore this name, especially as he declared his intention of translating into Latin and commenting upon all the works of Aristotle and also of Plato, and further of showing that harmony rather than, as generally supposed, discord existed in the teaching, not only of these two great philosophers, but also of most others who have borne the name [4]. But as a matter of fact this grand project does not appear to have been carried out, and the evidence points to his work not having gone beyond the logical treatises of Aristotle. The author of the translations referred to by Albertus and Aquinas must have been someone else, and possibly (though identity of name is not necessary to account for the attribution above indicated) one Boetius of Dalmatia, who is said to have translated some

[1] In the last two works, however, it was only the abridgement or paraphrase of Arabian writers that he translated (Jourdain, *l. c.*).

[2] Buhle's Aristotle, i. p. 323.

[3] See again Rashdall, *op. cit.*, vol. i. pp. 37, 358-361; and ii. p. 744.

[4] See his Introduction to the 'De Interpretatione' quoted by Jourdain, p. 53.

of the minor works of Aristotle, but of whose life or date little or nothing more is known (Jourdain, p. 57). Jourdain finds no evidence that Albertus used the 'Versio Boetiana,' but rather the contrary (p. 58).

The well-known Bishop Grostête of Lincoln is credited with a translation of the Ethics of Aristotle, 'ex primo fonte unde emanaverat, Graeco scilicet,' on the testimony of Hermann Alemannus, who himself (as we have seen) translated this and other works of Aristotle from the Arabic. But the only translation under this head with which we need practically concern ourselves is that which was made at the instance of St. Thomas Aquinas, supported by Pope Urban IV; for the positive evidence as well as antecedent probability points to this as the translation which was most likely employed by Dante. This translation was probably executed by William of Moerbeka or William of Brabant, of whom a Slav chronicler under the year 1273 writes thus: 'Wilhelmus de Brabantia, ordinis praedicatorum, transtulit omnes libros Aristotelis de graeco in latinum, verbum ex verbo, qua translatione scholares adhuc hodierna die utuntur in scholis, ad instantiam domini Thomae de Aquino' (Jourdain, p. 67). Some confusion seems to exist as to the identity or otherwise of this William with 'Henry of Brabant' and 'Thomas of Cantipré,' and whether they may not be 'πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφὴ μία' (see Jourdain, pp. 7, 40, 64). By another authority this translation is said to have been executed in 1271 (Jourdain, p. 67), the death of St. Thomas Aquinas being in 1274.

As to the relative dates of these two classes of translations, which we may call Arabo-Latin and Greco-Latin, Jourdain's general conclusions are as follows[1]:—

In the Physical works of Aristotle the Arabo-Latin translations held the field for a long time alone.

The De Anima was first translated from the Greek, and afterwards, by Michael Scot, from the Arabic.

The Metaphysics, the Ethics Bks. I–IV, and the Politics were first translated from the Greek, and afterwards from the Arabic. In the case of the Metaphysics, the latter translation

[1] Pp. 212 *seqq.*

is cited as *Translatio nova.* The first translation of the Ethics as a whole was from the Arabic.

The Rhetoric and the Poetics were translated only from the Greek, though they were known before this through an Arabic abridgement by Alfarabius and others.

It is easy to see that we have a ready test of the Arabic or Greek origin of a Latin translation in the forms of the transliterated words. Fortunately for this purpose the imperfect Greek knowledge of the translators of both classes renders the application of the test easy and frequent[1]. For no sooner does a word occur which is at all technical or unusual, than the translator, unable to give its meaning, takes refuge in transliteration. It is easy, for instance, to see the immediate Greek origin of such words as these, taken at random from the 'Antiqua Translatio' of the Ethics, printed with the works of St. Thomas Aquinas (in the great folio edition, Paris[2], 1647)—agrius, ephidexii, eutrapeli, nemeseticus, bomolochus (sometimes also 'homolochus'), discolus, yron, epycheia, acrybodykayos, and hosts of others. Similarly the translations of Michael Scot exhibit in Latin transliteration Arabicised forms of Greek words, or even Arabic words pure and simple written in Latin characters (see Jourdain, pp. 19, 335–342); and this appears also in the forms of proper names: e.g. Polybius is Blomoz, or Blomor; Ctesias, Artezez; Alcmaeon, Alkakalneon, &c. (*ib.* pp. 340, 1). Many Arabic terms or names appear in the meteorological words of Aristotle as paraphrased by Albertus Magnus, who used Michael Scot's translation.

It is natural to enquire next whether the 'Antiqua Translatio,' printed, as I have said, with the works of St. Thomas, is the one caused to be made by himself[3]. I think it is

[1] Jourdain mentions also the interesting fact that in translations of some of Aristotle's works made before the tenth century (including of course those of Boethius among others), at a time when the knowledge of both Greek and Latin still survived, words of this kind are not found. It is in translations made in and after the eleventh century that they begin to make their appearance.

[2] The 'Nova Translatio' printed alongside of it is the much later translation of Argyropylus.

[3] Prof. Bywater (Textual Criticism of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics, p. 10) observes that the Greek is followed so closely in this Translation that a MS.

pretty clearly shown that this is the case, from the fact that, as far as I have noticed, in all the cases of transliteration in the translation, such as those quoted above, these words appear in his commentary also. Some of his explanations of such words are very curious. Thus he hesitates between the forms *chaumotes* and *chapnotes* (for χαυνότης). The propriety of the former is explained to be 'ex eo quod *ardet* in iis quae pertinent ad appetitum honoris; nam *cauma* incendium dicitur: sed *capnos* in Graeco idem est quod fumus. Potest enim si sic scribatur *chapnotes* dici, quasi *fumositas*:' and he justifies the metaphor by comparing the Latin 'ventosus.' In the passage on 'apyrocalia et banausia,' the latter word is explained to come 'a *banos* quod est fornax, quia scilicet ad modum fornacis omnia consumunt.' In the case of the form epicacotarchia (for ἐπιχαιρεκακία) the correct meaning is arrived at, though by means of the curious statement that '*tarchus* dicitur *gaudens*'! This does not look as if St. Thomas' alleged acquaintance with Greek would carry him far.

We may then, I think, conclude (1) that in regard to most of Aristotle's works, and certainly of the Ethics (from which we shall draw most of our illustrations), several translations existed to which Dante may have had access; and we have seen that in one case at least he says that he has consulted two versions in the Meteorologica, and in another passage he speaks depreciatingly of a contemporary attempt to translate the Ethics into Italian; (2) that most likely he would have had recourse ordinarily to the great work which was backed by the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas, for whom Dante had the greatest reverence, and with whose writings he was intimately acquainted.

I will now bring together some illustrations selected from a large number of passages compared, which seem to me to prove the identity of the translation used by Dante with the 'Translatio Antiqua,' printed with the works of St. Thomas.

(1) Nic. Eth. I. iii. 4 is twice quoted by Dante. The

of the Translation 'is practically almost as good as a Greek MS. of the text to us.' I have frequently found that Febrer's Catalan Translation of the Divina Commedia can similarly be employed for purposes of textual criticism.

passage stands thus in the 'Translatio Antiqua': '*Disciplinati* est in tantum *certitudinem* (τὸ ἀκριβὲς) quaerere secundum unumquodque genus in quantum rei natura *recipit* (ἐπιδέχεται).' In Convito IV. xiii. l. 75, we have: 'il *disciplinato* chiede di sapere *certezza* nelle cose, secondochè la loro natura di certezza *riceva*[1].' In De Mon. II. ii. l. 63, this passage (combined apparently with Eth. I. vii. 18) appears thus: 'Non similiter in omni materia certitudo quaerenda est, sed secundum quod natura rei subiectae *recipit*.' The words *disciplinatus* and *recipit* are not the most natural (except in the sense of dogged literalness) representatives of the Greek here, and they both in fact disappear in the later translation of Argyropylus. The commentary of Aquinas has *disciplinatus* for πεπαιδευμένος, but *patitur* for ἐπιδέχεται. Also *certitudo* for ἀκριβὲς should be noticed. This becomes *exactum* in the later translation.

(2) In Inf. xi. 82, 3 the names of the three types of vice, incontinenza, malizia, . . . bestialitade, correspond exactly with the words in this translation, 'malitia, incontinentia et bestialitas.' St. Thomas has the same words in the commentary. In the later translation we find '*vitium*, incontinentiam, feritatem.' Brunetto Latini, Tes. vi. c. 37 (Giamboni's version), has 'malizia, *crudeltà* and lussuria.' It looks as if he had had *feritas* in his translation and had understood it to mean *crudeltà*.

(3) In Ethics IV. ix. 4, where Aristotle says, 'Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπιεικοῦς ἐστὶν ἡ αἰσχύνη,' this appears in the Translatio Antiqua, 'neque enim *studiosi* est verecundia.' In the reference to this passage by Dante in Conv. IV. xix. ll. 84, 5, we find, 'vergogna non è laudabile, nè sta bene ne' vecchi nè negli uomini *studiosi*.' In the later translation we have *probus*. In Ethics IV. viii. 5, ἐπιεικὴς is rendered by *modestus*.

(4) The possible light thrown on the interpretation of the difficult passage in Inf. ii. 88–90 has been already discussed. (See pp. 106–8.)

[1] The passage is also quoted in the Quaestio, § 20, but the great uncertainty as to the genuineness of that work prevents us here and elsewhere from basing any argument upon it.

(5) There are several quotations in the De Monarchia, and, this treatise being written in Latin, the almost directly *verbatim* character of the quotations will be seen by comparing the text with the Antiqua Translatio cited by Witte in his footnotes.

The following may perhaps be taken as samples:—

(1)	De Mon.	II. viii. l. 17	Ethics I. ii. 8.
(2)	,,	III. i. ll. 17, 18	,, I. vi. 1.
(3)	,,	II. vi. ll. 46 *seqq.*	,, VI. ix. 5.
(4)	,,	III. vi. l. 52	,, VI. ii. 6.

In (3), *sortiri* is scarcely the most natural word for two translators to have hit upon independently for τυχεῖν: and in (4), the words 'non genita' in Dante and 'ingenita' in the Antiqua Translatio involve in each case the confusion of ἀγένητα and ἀγέννητα. The same words occur in both cases in St. Thomas' commentary.

(6) I will conclude this very imperfect and fragmentary sketch with a discussion, and, as I hope, an identification of the 'Old' and 'New' Translations of Aristotle's Meteorologica referred to in the passage already quoted from Conv. II. xv. Dante, it will be remembered, is giving the different explanations that have been suggested of the phenomenon of the Galaxy or Milky Way, the 'Via di San Jacopo' as he says it was popularly called, no doubt from a curious confusion of *Galassia* and *Galizia*!

Dante mentions first, without however assigning Aristotle as the source of his information, the view of the Pythagoreans, that that tract of the heavens was burnt by the passage of the sun across it formerly, when out of his proper course, a tradition embodied in the legend of Phaethon. (See Inf. xvii. 107, 108, and Meteor. I. viii. 345 a. 13–18.) Next, the opinion of Anaxagoras and Democritus is stated to have been that it was due to some peculiar reflexion of the light of the sun (*ripercosso in quella parte*). This is different from the opinion ascribed to those two philosophers by Aristotle, *l. c.*, and seems rather to correspond with the third and an anonymous theory mentioned by him, viz. that it was ἀνάκλασις . . . τῆς ἡμετέρας ὄψεως πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον (345 b. 10 *seqq.*).

This is a difficult and rather inaccurate expression, but it seems to bear somewhat the meaning of the words above cited from Dante, since Aristotle, in his elaborate refutation of this view, speaks of the sun as acting the part of a reflecting mirror. But in any case the second theory mentioned by Aristotle, and by him ascribed to Anaxagoras and Democritus, is as follows—that the Milky Way is due to the light of certain stars which are protected from the light of the sun at night by the shadow of the earth, and consequently shine by their own light (*οἰκεῖον φῶς*), which is not extinguished or rendered invisible by the sun's superior brilliancy as is the case with other small stars not so protected. Aristotle refutes this by two very simple and cogent arguments, viz. (1) that the form or position of the Milky Way is not altered by the movements of the sun; and (2) that the shadow of the earth cannot reach nearly so far as to the fixed stars. Having refuted these three theories, Aristotle proceeds to give his own, viz. that the phenomenon is due to combustion in the higher regions of the air, when or where the composition of the atmosphere is favourable to such combustion. Comets and the solar halo are isolated examples of this, and we may well suppose that in the case of a peculiarly large aggregation of stars the same result may follow as that which occurs in the single instances above named.

Now let us turn once more to the Convito. We have seen that Dante is in agreement with Aristotle as to the Pythagorean theory; that he seems to attribute (though somewhat obscurely) to Anaxagoras and Democritus the third and anonymous theory cited and refuted by Aristotle, and that he omits to mention the theory which Aristotle assigns to those two philosophers. When Dante proceeds next in order to speak of Aristotle's own view, we have a very remarkable statement:—'What Aristotle said about this cannot well be ascertained, since his opinion is not found to be the same *in one translation as in the other*[1].' Dante then proceeds to

[1] Albertus Magnus confesses himself in a similar difficulty in a passage curiously like this: 'Quod autem haec vera sint quae dicta sunt testatur Aristotelis translatio Arabica quae sic dicit. . . . Graeca autem translatio discordat ab

give the opinion of Aristotle which I have explained above, on the authority of the *New Translation*; while he says that the *Old Translation* ascribes to Aristotle the opinion that the Milky Way was an aggregation of stars too minute or too closely packed for us to distinguish their light separately. The same opinion, he adds, seems to have been held by Avicenna and Ptolemy, and Dante evidently himself inclines to it, since he establishes by its help an appropriate point of resemblance between the Galaxy and the Science of Metaphysics.

It seemed to me that such a difference as this ought to afford a crucial test to identify the two translations thus indicated. On referring to Jourdain, it would appear that there were at least four extant translations of the Meteorologica to which Dante might possibly have had access. (i) A composite work in which three authors had a hand, the best known of them being Gerardus of Cremona (d. 1187), who also was the translator of the first three books, including therefore the part with which we are now concerned. This was a translation into Latin from an Arabic version (p. 168). Gerardus also translated from the Arabic the Almagest of Ptolemy (p. 121).

(ii) A translation by the celebrated Michael Scot, who died *c.* 1290. (See Inf. xx. 115–17.) This was also made from the Arabic.

(iii) An anonymous translation made in 1268 direct from the Greek (p. 75).

(iv) The translation executed for and probably employed by St. Thomas Aquinas. This was direct from the Greek (pp. 39, 40, 393, 398), and is most likely that printed with his works as the Antiqua Translatio.

Now it is evident that the very different opinions assigned to Aristotle are not, strictly speaking, a matter of *translation*. The so-called translator in the case of what Dante calls the

hac, et (ut puto) est mendosa' (quoted by Jourdain, p. 38). Albertus goes on to say that in many other cases he finds the Greek translations better than the Arabic. Of course Latin translations from Greek or Arabic respectively are referred to in this expression.

'Old Translation' must have allowed himself considerable liberty in 'editing' or 'revising' Aristotle's text, since it is the version of the New Translation which correctly represents the text. The former must in fact have assumed the function taken upon themselves by some modern editors, and Giuliani in particular, in dealing with the text of the Convito. In short, he deliberately substituted for what he found in Aristotle a theory which he believed to be more correct. He took upon himself to bring Aristotle 'up to date[1].' The assertion of Dante that the view attributed to Aristotle in the Old Translation corresponds with the theory of Avicenna and Ptolemy on this subject seemed to me to suggest the clue that this 'improvement' was probably introduced into the *Arabic* version of Aristotle's works. And this in fact proves to be the case. For since Albertus Magnus used Michael Scot's translation made from the Arabic, for this part at any rate of Aristotle's works (see Jourdain, pp. 312 *seqq.*), and St. Thomas Aquinas the later Graeco-Latin translation, we are able to test the point in this way. In Albertus Magnus, De Meteoris, Bk. I. Tract ii. c. 5, Aristotle is represented thus:—'Dicamus nunc quid est galaxia secundum veritatem: nihil aliud est galaxia nisi *multae stellae parvae quasi contiguae in illo loco orbis.*' This is exactly what Dante says he found in the Old Translation.

Turning now to Aquinas, Meteor., Lib. I. Lectio xiii, we read: '. . . quia videlicet in hac parte coeli est efficax virtus stellarum ad adtrahendam exhalationem, et non est causa vehemens [such as he has just explained the motion of the sun or moon to be, which 'citius disgregat exhalationem'] quae impediat eius adunationem, sicut accidit sub Zodiaco circulo. Ista igitur exhalatio adunata sub tali parte coeli facit ibi videri lacteam claritatem,' &c. And this is what Dante found in the New Translation, and what occurs also in the actual text of Aristotle.

[1] A curious instance of a similar liberty is recorded by Jourdain, where, in De Coelo, II. x. (*fin.*), the words ὥσπερ καὶ δεικνύουσιν οἱ μαθηματικοί are translated (?) 'sicut declaraverunt mathematici, sicut in Almagesti!' (p. 313). Thus Aristotle is made to quote Ptolemy!

We conclude then that Dante's 'New Translation' corresponds with what has now become the 'Antiqua Translatio,' as printed in the works of Aquinas; and his 'Old Translation' corresponds with the still more ancient translation made by Michael Scot. I say 'corresponds' because there may possibly have been other translations based upon these to which he had access. They at any rate certainly represent the two families of translations which are here distinguished [1].

[1] Dr. Henry Jackson has kindly drawn my attention to the following passage from the Epistolae of Lionardo Bruni (Aretino), Book VII. iv. *ad fin.* (vol. ii. p. 89, Ed. Florence, 1741):—

'Nullam Boetii interpretationem habemus praeterquam Porphyrii et Predicamentorum et Perihermenias librorum; quos si accurate leges, videbis summum illum virum sine ullis ineptiis libros illos transtulisse. Textus est nitidus et planus et Graeco respondens. At enim in Ethicis et Physicis quid tandem est praeter ineptias meras? Non verba in iis Latina, non dicendi figura, non eruditio litterarum, praeterea ab ipso Graeco male accepta complura. Haec a Boetio longe absunt, viro in utraque lingua docto et eleganti. Nunquam ille architectonicam, nunquam bomolcos, nunquam agricos, quorum vocabula in Latino habemus, in Graeco reliquisset . . . Atque, ut scias, duae fuerunt ante me, quod equidem viderim, interpretationes Ethicorum: una quam ex Arabe lingua traductam constat post Averrois philosophi tempora, quae, quoniam anterior est, *vetus* appellatur. Altera haec posterior et novior a Britanno quodam traducta, cuius etiam proemium legimus. Quomodo igitur Boetii fuit ista nova interpretatio, cum vetusta illa et anterior post Averroim fuit, Boetius vero aliquot seculis Averroin anteeat. . . .' Then, after denouncing the Englishman's work, both in respect of inelegance of style and actual blunders, he concludes: 'Equidem si in picturam Iocti quis faecem proiceret, pati non possem. Quid ergo existimas michi accedere cum Aristotelis libros omni pictura elegantiores tanta traductionis faece coinquinari videam? An non commoveri? an non turbari?'

This passage occurs almost *totidem verbis* in another Epistle, Bk. IV. xxii. (vol. i. p. 139), and there the following sentence is added respecting the 'Britannus quidam':—'in quo et fratrem se ordinis Praedicatorum scribit, et rogatu confratrum de his transferendis laborem suscepisse.' Compare with this *supra*, p. 310.

INDEXES TO QUOTATIONS

LIST OF AUTHORS

	PAGE		PAGE
The Vulgate	321	Juvenal	353
Aristotle	334	Cicero	353
Plato	343	Livy	354
Homer	344	Orosius	355
Virgil	344	Boethius	355
Horace	348	Seneca	356
Ovid	349	St. Augustine	357
Lucan	351	Minor Authors	357
Statius	352		

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS. No. I.

[*In the order of Authors quoted*]

[For explanations of *a*, *b*, *c* see sup., pp. 45, 46. * indicates a passage specially discussed. The reference to the page is given in Index II. The numbers of the lines in Dante's Prose Works are those of 'the Oxford Dante,' 1894.]

The Vulgate [1].

*	*b.*	Vulg. Hieronymi Prol. 'Galeatus' . .	Par. vii 3.
*	*a.*	—— Hieronymi Prol. 'Paulino' . . .	Conv. IV. v. l. 143.
	b.	Genesis i. 2	Par. xxix. 21.
	a.	—— i. 9	Quaest. xxi. l. 69.
	c.	——	Inf. xxxiv. 113.
	a.	—— i. 16	Mon. III. iv. l. 10.
	a.	—— i. 26	Mon. I. viii. l. 10.
	a.	——	Conv. IV. xii. l. 143.
	b.	——	Epist. vii. 7. l. 156.
	b.	—— i. 31	Par. xxix. 23.
	c.	—— ii. 5, 6	Purg. xxviii. 121–124.
	c.	—— ii. 7	Purg. xvii. 114.
	c.	——	Purg. xxv. 70–72.
	b.	—— ii. 7, 21, 22	Par. vii. 142, 147, 148.
	b.	—— ii. 8, 15	Par. i. 57.
	c.	—— ii. 9	Purg. xxviii. 118–120.
	a.	—— ii. 15; iii. 19	Inf. xi. 106–108.
	b.	—— ii. 17	Purg. xxiv. 115.
	b.	—— ii. 21, 2	Par. xiii. 37–39.
	b.	—— iii. 1–5	V. El. I. ii. l. 43.
	a.	—— iii. 2, 3	V. El. I. iv. l. 13.
	b.	—— iii. 4–6	Purg. viii. 99; xxxii. 32.
	b.	—— iii. 5, 6 (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 14) .	Purg. xxix. 24–27.
	b.	—— iii. 6	Par. xiii. 39.
*	*c.*	—— iii. 7	Inf. xxxi. 61.
	c.	—— iii. 19	Purg. xxxi. 51.
	c.	—— iii. 24	Purg. viii. 25, 26.

[1] N. B. All references are given to chapters and verses as they stand in the Vulgate version.

*	*b.*	Genesis iv. 14	Purg. xiv. 133.
	b.	—— v. 5	Par. xxvi. 122.
	b.	—— ix. 12–17	Par. xii. 17, 18.
*	*b.*	—— x. 9, 10 (comp. xi. 9)	Inf. xxxi. 77, 78.
	b.	—— x. 21	V. El. I. vi. l. 54.
	b.	—— xi. 2 (comp. x. 9, 10; xi. 9) .	Purg. xii. 34–36.
	b.	—— xi. 2, 4, 9	V. El. I. vii. ll. 28–31.
	b.	—— xi. 6–9	Par. xxvi. 126.
	b.	—— xi. 9.	V. El. I. vi. l. 52.
*	*c.*	—— xix. 24	Inf. xiv. 28, 29.
	b.	——	Purg. xxvi. 40.
*	*a.*	—— xxv. 22–25	Par. xxxii. 67–70.
*	*c.*	—— xxvi. 5	Inf iv. 57, 58.
	b.	—— xxvii. 22	Mon. I. xiii. l. 23.
	c.	—— xxviii. 12	Par. xxi. 28–33.
	b.	——	Par. xxii. 70–72.
	b.	—— xxix. 16, 17	Purg. xxvii. 100-8[1].
	a.	—— xxix. 34, 5	Mon III. v. l. 8, 9.
	b.	—— xxix. 20, 28	Inf. iv. 60.
	b.	—— xxxix. 14 *seqq.*	Inf. xxx. 97.
	a.	Exodus ii. 14.	Mon. II. xiii. l. 36.
	a.	—— vii. 9.	Mon. II. viii. l 57.
	a.	—— viii. 18, 19	Mon. II. iv. ll. 11–14.
	a.	—— xviii. 17 *seqq.*	Mon. I. xiv. ll. 65 *seqq.*
	a.	—— xxxiii. 19	Par. xxvi. 42.
	a.	Levit. ii. 11	Mon. III. xiii. l. 66.
	b.	—— x. 1	Epist. viii. 4. l. 55.
	b.	—— xi. 3, 4 (*or* Deut. xiv. 6, 7) . .	Purg. xvi. 99.
	a.	—— xi. 43	Mon. III. xiii. l. 74.
	a.	—— xvii. 3, 4	Mon. II. viii. l. 37.
	c.	—— xvii. 14	Purg. v. 74.
	b.	—— xxvii. 10–13; 28–33	Par. v. 49–51.
	b.	Numb. xiv. 22, 23; 29, 30	Purg. xviii. 133–135.
	a.	—— xviii. 20	Mon. III. xiv. l. 33.
	b.	——	Purg. xvi. 131, 132.
	b.	—— xxii. 28 *seqq.*	Epist. viii. 8. l. 129.
	b.	——	V. El. I. ii. l. 45.
	a.	Deuter. vi. 4	Mon. I. viii. l. 23.
	a.	—— xxxii. 35[2]	Epist. vi. 1. l. 22.
	b.	Joshua ii. 1 *seqq.*	Par. ix. 116–125.
	b.	—— vii. 18 *seqq.*	Purg. xx. 109–111.
	a.	—— x. 12, 13	Epist. vii. 2. l. 28.
*	*b.*	Judges vii. 7–9	Purg. xxiv. 124–6.
*	*b.*	—— xi. 31	Par. v. 66.
	a.	1 Sam. xv. 10, 11	Mon. II. viii. l. 56.
	a.	—— xv. 16, 23, 28	Mon. III. vi. l. 4.

[1] Dante's description of Leah and Rachel comes not so much from what is said of them in Genesis *l. c.*, as from the patristic adaptation of the two sisters as types of the Active and Contemplative Lives. [2] Or Rom. xii. 19; Heb. x. 30.

a.	1 Sam.	xv. 17, 18	Epist. vii. 5. ll. 102 *seqq.*
b.	——	xvii. 49, 50	Epist. vii. 8. ll. 178 *seqq.*
c.	——	xxv. 26	Inf. vi. 65.
b.	——	xxxi. 4	Purg. xii. 40.
b.	2 Sam.	i. 21	Purg. xii. 41, 42.
b.	——		Epist. vi. 3, l. 68.
b.	——	vi. 1–17	Par. xx. 39.
b.	——	vi. 3–7, 12–16.	Purg. x. 55–69.
b.	——	vi. 6, 7	Epist. viii. 4. ll. 67–9.
* *b.*	——	vi. 12	Purg. x. 59.
* *b.*	——	vi. 14	Purg. x. 65.
b.	——	xv. 12 *seqq.*	Inf. xxviii. 137, 138.
a.	1 Kings	iii. 5	Par. xiii. 93.
a.	——	iii. 9	Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 60 *seqq.*
b.	——	iii. 12	Par. x. 112–114.
c.	——	viii. 27	Purg. xi. 2.
b.	——	x. 1, 7	Epist. x. 1. ll. 10, 13 *seqq.*
b.	——	xii. 14, 18	Purg. xii. 46–48.
c.	——	xxii. 17	Epist. v. 7. l. 112.
b.	2 Kings	xix. 37 (*or* ‖ in 2 Chron. & Is.)	Purg. xii. 52–4.
b.	——	ii. 11, 12	Inf. xxvi. 35–39.
a.	——	ii. 24	Inf. xxvi. 34.
* *b.*	——	xx. 1–6 and 2 Chron. xxxii. 26	Par. xx. 51.
a.	2 Kings	xx. 11 (for ‘filius Amos,’ see v. 1)	Epist. vii. 2. l. 28.
a.	2 Chron.	xx. 12	Mon. II. viii. l. 61.
b.	Tobit	iii. 25	Par. iv. 48.
* *b.*	Judith	xiv. 4, 16; & xv. 1	Purg. xii. 58–60.
* *b.*	Esther	v. 14; vii. 10	Purg. xvii. 25–30.
c.	Job	vii. 1	Par. v. 117; xxv. 57.
a.	——	xi. 7	Quaest. xxii. l. 6.
a.	Psalm	i. 3	Mon. I. i. l. 10.
b.	——	ii. 1	Mon. II. xii. l. 1.
a.	——	ii. 1–3	Mon. II. i. ll. 1–6.
* *a.*	——	iv. 8	Mon. I. xv. l. 22.
* *a.*	——	viii. 2	Conv. II. iv. l. 42.
a.	——	viii. 2, 5–7	Conv. IV. xix. ll. 60–68.
b.	——	viii. 3	Epist. viii. 5. l. 76.
a.	——	viii. 6	Mon. I. iv. l. 14.
* *a.*	——	ix. 11	Par. xxv. 73, 4; 98.
c.	——	x. 5	Inf. i. 128.
a.	——	x. 8	Mon. II. x. l. 10.
c.	——	xiii. 1 (*or* lii. 1)	Inf. xi. 47.
c.	——	xvi. 8 (and many similar passages)	Par. vi. 7.
* *a.*	——	xviii. 2	Conv. II. vi. l. 103.
c.	——	xxiii. 3, 4	Purg. xxx. 74, 75.
c.	——	xxiv. 10	Par. vii. 103–105.
a.	——	xxx. 2–9	Purg. xxx. 83, 84.
a.	——	xxxi. 1 (*or* lii. 1)	Purg. xxix. 3.
* *b.*	——	xxxi. 9	Purg. xiv. 143.
b.	——		Mon. III. xvi. l. 74.

	c.	Psalm	xliv. 2	Epist. iv. 1. l. 1.
	a.	——	xlix. 16	Mon. I. xiii. l. 30.
	a.	——	l. 3 *seqq.*	Purg. v. 24.
	a.	——	l. 3	Par. xxxii. 12.
	a.	——	l. 9	Purg. xxxi. 98.
	a.	——	l. 17	Purg. xxiii. 11.
*	*b.*	——	liv. 16	Inf. xxxiii. 122 *seqq.*
	c.	——	lvii. 11	Purg. xx. 94, 95.
	a.	——	lxii. 12	Conv. IV. xvi. l. 1.
	b.	——	lxiv. 5	Inf. i. 129.
	a.	——	lxviii. 10	Epist. viii. 5. l. 75.
	a.	——	lxxi. 2	Mon. I. xiii. l. 61.
	c.	——	lxxvii. 25[1]	Par. ii. 11.
		——	. . . . .	Conv. I. i. l. 52.
	a.	——	lxxviii. 1	Purg. xxxiii. 1.
	a.	——	xci. 5	Purg. xxviii. 80.
	a.	——	xciv. 2	Epist. v. 4. l. 62.
	a.	——	xciv. 5	Mon. III. xv. l. 36.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Epist. v. 7. l. 114.
	c.	——	xcv. 10[2]	Inf. v. 60.
	a.	——	xcix. 3	Conv. III. iv. l. 76.
	a.	——	ciii. 9	Conv. IV. xxiii. l. 79.
	a.	——	cx. 9[3]	Mon. III. iii. l. 76.
	a.	——	cxi. 7	Mon. III. i. l. 31.
	a.	——	cxiii. 1	Purg. ii. 46.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Conv. II. i. l. 57.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Epist. x. 7. l. 142.
*	*b.*	——	cxiii. 3, 5	Par. xxii. 94.
*	*c.*	——	cxiii. 1 *bis* (?)	Par. xi. 96.
	a.	——	cxiii. 2 *bis* (*or* Ps. lxxviii. 10) .	Epist. viii. 3. l. 35.
	b.	——	cxviii. 1	Epist. vi. 5. l. 146.
	a.	——	cxviii. 25	Purg. xix. 73.
*	*c.*	——	cxviii. 130	Purg. xxii. 128, 129.
	b.	——	cxx. 1	Par. xxv. 38.
*	*c.*	——	cxx. 6	Purg. xxviii. 33.
*	*c.*	——	cxxv. 5	Purg. xxxi. 46.
	a.	——	cxxxii. 1	Mon. I. xvi. l. 36.
	b.	——	cxxxvi. 1	Par. xxiii. 134, 135.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Epist. vii. 1. l. 10.
	b.	——	cxxxvi. 1 *seqq.*	Epist. vii. 8. l. 187.
	c.	——	cxxxviii. 3	Par. xv. 62, 63.
	a.	——	cxxxviii. 6	Quaest. xxii. l. 9.
	a.	——	cxxxviii. 7–9	Epist. x. 22. l. 416.
*	*a.*	Prov.	i. 8	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 142.
*	*a.*	——	i. 10	Conv. IV. xxiv. ll. 145-7.
*	*b.*	——	i. 17	Purg. xxxi. 62.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Epist. vi. 5. l. 144.

[1] Comp. Wisdom xvi. 20. [2] Comp. 'correctio sedis' in Ps. xcvi. 2.
[3] Quoted thus, 'ut ait Propheta,' as again in Conv. II. i. l. 57.

	c.	Prov.	iii. 12	Par. xv. 88.
*	*c.*	——	iii. 16	Par. xii. 128, 129.
	a.	——	iii. 34	Conv. IV. xxv. l. 17.
	a.	——	iv. 18	Conv. III. xv. l. 190.
*	*a.*	——	iv. 18, 19	Conv. IV. vii. ll. 98–102.
*	*c.*	——	iv. 19	Inf. i. 61.
*	*a.*	——	iv. 24	Conv. IV. xxv. l. 19.
*	*a.*	——	v. 23	Conv. IV. vii. l. 131.
	a.	——	viii. 6	Conv. IV. v. l. 14.
	a.	——	viii. 7	Mon. III. i. l. 15.
	a.	——	viii. 17	Conv. III. xi. l. 128.
	a.	——	viii. 23	Conv. III. xiv. l. 62.
	c.	——	viii. 27	Par. xix. 40.
*	*a.*	——	viii. 27–30	Conv. III. xv. ll. 167 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	xv. 31	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 162.
	b.	——	xvi. 8	Purg. xx. 26, 27.
	a.	——	xxii. 28	Conv. IV. vii. l. 96.
	b.	——	xxiii. 26	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 74.
	c.	——	xxiv. 16	Inf. viii. 97 [1].
*	*a.*	——	xxix. 20	Conv. IV. xv. ll. 137 *seqq.*
	b.	——	xxx. 15	Epist. viii. 7. l. 110.
	a.	Eccles.	iii. 7	Conv. IV. ii. l. 74.
	a.	——	iii. 21	Conv. IV. xv. l. 69.
	a.	——	v. 12	Conv. II. xi. l. 82.
	c.	——	ix. 12	Purg. xiv. 145.
*	*a.*	——	x. 16, 17	Conv. IV. vi. ll. 174 *seqq.*
	a.	——		Conv. IV. xvi. ll. 49 *seqq.*
	c.	——	xi. 7	Inf. x. 69.
	a.	Cantic.	i. 3	Mon. III. iii. l. 79.
*	*c.*	——	i. 5	Purg. xi. 116, 117.
	c.	——	ii. 3	Purg. xxxii. 73.
	c.	——	ii. 16 (?)	Par. xxiii. 73, 74.
	a.	——	iv. 8	Purg. xxx. 11.
	c.	——	iv. 9 [2]	Purg. xxx. 40, 41.
*	*c.*	——	v. 10, 11	Purg. xxix. 114.
	a.	——	vi. 7, 8	Conv. II. xv. l. 175.
	a.	——	viii. 5	Conv. II. vi. l. 34.
	a.	——		Mon. III. x. l. 59.
*	*a.*	Wisd.	i. 1	Par. xviii. 91–3.
	a.	——	i. 7	Epist. x. 22. l. 420.
	c.	——	ii. 24	Inf. i. 111.
	c.	——		Par. ix. 129.
	c.	——	iii. 7	Par. vii. 8.
	a.	——	iii. 11	Conv. III. xv. l. 45.
	c.	——	v. 15	Inf. xxiv. 49–51.
	a.	——	vi. 23	Conv. IV. vi. l. 164.
	a.	——		Conv. IV. xvi. l. 8.

[1] See *Scart.* note *l. c.* [2] This reference is probable, since verse 8 is definitely quoted a few lines above, viz. l. 11.

*	*c.*	Wisd.	vii. 2	Purg. xxv. 50, 51.
	a.	——	vii. 14	Epist. x. 2. l. 40.
*	*c.*	——	vii. 25	Purg. xi. 6.
	c.	——	vii. 25, 26	Conv. III. xii. ll. 100 *seqq.*
	c.	——	vii. 26	Purg. xxxi. 139.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Conv. III. xv. l. 54.
	c.	——	vii. 29	Conv. III. xii. l. 84.
*	*c.*	——	viii. 3 (comp. also ix. 9) . . .	Conv. IV. xxx. l. 66.
	c.	——	ix. 9	Conv. III. viii. l. 209[1].
	b.	——	. . . . .	Conv. III. xv. l. 162.
*	*a.*	Ecclus.	i. 3	Conv. III. viii. l. 14.
	a.	——	iii. 22	Conv. III. viii. l. 16.
	c.	——	iv. 18, 19	Conv. III. xv. l. 205 *seqq.*
	c.	——	vi. 21, 22	. . . . .
	c.	——	viii. 18 *seqq.*	Par. xvii. 61 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	ix. 10	Inf. xviii. 130 (cf. l. 111).
	c.	——	x. 15	Purg. xii. 121–3.
*	*c.*	——	xiv. 6.	Inf. xxvi. 24.
*	*c.*	——	xviii. 1	Par. xxix. 28–30.
	a.	——	xxiv. 14	Conv. III. xiv. l. 58.
	c.	——	xxiv. 29 (E. V. *v.* 21)	Purg. xxxi. 129.
	c.	——	. . . . .	Par. ii. 11, 12.
	c.	——	xl. 1 (*fin.*)	Purg. xi. 63.
	c.	——	xli. 1	Inf. i. 7.
	a.	——	xlii. 16	Epist. x. 22. l. 422.
	c.	——	xliv. 9	Inf. iii. 49–51, 64.
*	*c.*	——	xlvi. 3 (?)	Par. ix. 123.
	c.	Isaiah	i. 21 (*or* Lam. i. 1).	Purg. vi. 78[2].
	b.	——	vi. 2	Par. ix. 78.
	b.	——	vi. 3 (*or* Rev. iv. 8)	Par. xxvi. 69.
	a.	——	vi. 6, 7	Mon. III. i. l. 24.
	a.	——	xi. 1	Conv. IV. v. l. 43.
	a.	——	xi. 2, 3	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 110.
	c.	——	xi. 5 (comp. Prov. xxxi. 17) . .	Purg. vii. 114.
*	*c.*	——	xxii. 22	Inf. xiii. 58–60.
	c.	——	xl. 6 (*fin.*)	Purg. xi. 115.
	a.	——	liii. 4	Epist. vi. 6. l. 187.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Mon. II. xiii. l. 44.
	b.	——	lv. 9	Purg. xxxiii. 88–90.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Quaest. xxii. l. 11.
*	*c.*	——	lvii. 4	Inf. xvii. 74.
*	*a.*	——	lxi. 7, 10	Par. xxv. 91.
	b.	Jerem.	v. 6	Inf. i. 32, 45, 49.
	c.	——	vii. 11	Par. xxii. 76, 77.
	c.	——	xv. 1[3]	Par. iv. 29.
	a.	——	xxiii. 24	Epist. x. 22. l. 414.

[1] Illustrate *mosse* by Inf. i. 40. [2] Comp. Conv. I. ix. l. 34. [3] This may probably have suggested to Dante the selection of these two Old Testament Saints.

c.	Jerem.	xlviii. 11	Purg. vii. 117.
c.	Lamen.	i. 1 [1] (*or* Is. i. 21)	Purg. vi. 78.
a.	——		V. N. xxix. *init.*; xxxi. l. 8.
a.	——	i. 1	Epist. viii. 1. l. 1.
b.	——	i. 7	Epist. viii. 3. l. 34.
a.	——	i. 12 [2]	V. N. vii. l. 41.
a.	Ezekiel	i. 4–6	Purg. xxix. 100–105.
c.	——	i. 28 (*or* Rev. iv. 3)	Purg. xxix. 78.
a.	——	ii. 1	Epist. x. 28. l. 551.
a.	——	viii. 16	Epist. viii. 4. l. 53.
a.	——	xxviii. 12, 13	Epist. x. 27. l. 521.
c.	——	xlvii. 12 (comp. Rev. xxii. 2)	Par. xviii. 30.
b.	Daniel	i. 8–17	Purg. xxii. 146, 147.
a.	——	ii. 3	Epist. x. 28. l. 560.
b.	——	ii. 10–13, 28 *seqq.*	Par. iv. 13–15.
b.	——	ii. 32, 33	Inf. xiv. 106 *seqq.*
c.	——	iii. 94 (comp. Luke xxi. 18)	Purg. xxvii. 27.
a.	——	vi. 22	Mon. III. i. l. 1.
a.	——	vii. 10	Par. xxix. 133–135.
c.	Hosea	viii. 4	Inf. xix. 112.
b.	Joel	iii. 2, 12	Inf. x. 11.
* *c.*	Zechar.	xiv. 6, 7 (?)	Inf. xxxi. 10.
b.	1 Mac.	vii. 4–12	Epist. viii. 4. l. 65.
c.	——	xvi. 11–17 [3]	Inf. xxxiii. 124.
b.	2 Mac.	iii. 25 *seqq.*	Purg. xx. 113.
a.	——	iv. 7 *seqq.*	Inf. xix. 85, 86.
b.	——	ix. 5	Purg. xiv. 151.
a.	Matt.	ii. 11	Mon. III. vii. l. 1.
b.	——	iii. 4 (*or* ‖ in Mark)	Purg. xxii. 151, 152.
c.	——	iii. 15	Purg. xxxii. 48.
a.	——		Epist. vii. 3. l. 73.
c.	——	iii. 17 (and ‖ s)	Par. xv. 88 [4].
a.	——	iv. 6, 11 (*or* ‖ in Luke)	Conv. II. vi. l. 30.
a.	——	iv. 19 (*or* John xxi. 19)	Inf. xix. 93.
a.	——	v. 3	Purg. xii. 110.
c.	——		Par. xi. 111.
a.	——	v. 5	Purg. xix. 50.
a.	——	v. 6	Purg. xxii. 4–6.
b.	——		Purg. xxiv. 151–154.
b.	——		Epist. v. 1. l. 13.
a.	——	v. 7	Purg. xv. 38.
a.	——	v. 8	Purg. xxvii. 8.
a.	——	v. 9	Purg. xvii. 68, 69.
b.	——	v. 22	V. El. I. xii. l. 35.

[1] 'Princeps provinciarum.' Comp. a similar metaphor in Conv. I. ix. l. 34.
[2] Perhaps there may be a reminiscence of this passage also at Inf. xxviii. 132 and xxx. 60. [3] Hence the name 'Tolomea.' [4] The expression *compiacemmi* (its application also being identical) seems clearly borrowed from its Scriptural use as above. Comp. Prov. iii. 12.

	a.	Matt.	v. 44	Purg. xiii. 36.
	a.	——	v. 45	Epist. x. 28. l. 563.
	b.	——	vi. 9–13 (comp. Luke xi. 2–4) .	Purg. xi. 1–21.
	c.	——	vi. 16	Inf. xxiii. 92.
	a.	——	vii. 2	Mon. II. iii. l. 24.
	a.	——	vii. 6	Conv. IV. xxx. l. 38.
	b.	——	vii. 15	Par. xxvii. 55.
	a.	——	vii. 15, 16	Conv. IV. xvi. l. 109.
	c.	——	vii. 16	Inf. xv. 65, 66.
	c.	——	vii. 21–23	Par. xix. 106–108.
	b.	——	viii. 24–26 (*or* ‖ s)	Epist. viii. 5. ll. 90, 91.
*	*a.*	——	x. 8	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 75.
	a.	——	x. 9	Mon. III. x. l. 109.
	a.	——	x. 34, 35	Mon. III. ix. l. 132.
	c.	——	xi. 11 (*or* Luke vii. 28) . . .	Par. xxxii. 31.
	a.	——	xi. 12	Par. xx. 94.
	c.	——	xii. 41 (comp. viii. 11, 12) . .	Par. xix. 109–111.
	c.	——	xiii. 3 *seqq.*	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 114.
	b.	——	xiii. 30	Par. xii. 119, 120.
	b.	——	xiv. 6–8 (*or* ‖ in Mark) . . .	Par. xviii. 135.
*	*a.*	——	xiv. 28	Par. xxiv. 38, 39.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Mon. III. ix. l. 90.
	a.	——	xv. 2, 3	Mon. III. iii. ll. 99–104.
	c.	——	xv. 8, 9	Purg. iv. 134, 135.
	c.	——	xv. 14	Purg. xviii. 18.
*	*a.*	——	. . . . .	Conv. I. xi. ll. 30 *seqq.*
	c.	——	xv. 27 (comp. Luke xvi. 21) .	Conv. I. i. l. 70.
	a.	——	xvi. 15, 16, 21, 23	Mon. III. ix. ll. 70 *seqq.*
	a.	——	xvi. 18	Mon. III. x. l. 53.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Mon. III. xiv. l. 22.
	a.	——	xvi. 19	Inf. xix. 91, 92.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Mon. III. viii. ll. 2, 41.
	b.	——	xvi. 24 (and ‖ passages) . . .	Par. xiv. 106.
	a.	——	xvii. 1 (*or* ‖ in Mark & Luke) .	Conv. II. i. l. 46.
	a.	——	xvii. 1–8 (*or* ‖ in Mark & Luke).	Purg. xxxii. 73–81.
	a.	——	xvii. 4	Mon. III. ix. l. 84.
	a.	——	xvii. 6	Epist. x. 28, l. 549.
	c.	——	xviii. 10	V. N. xliii. l. 16.
	c.	——	xviii. 15	Conv. I. ii. l. 30.
	a.	——	xviii. 18	Mon. III. viii. ll. 2–8.
	a.	——	xviii. 20	Mon. II. x. l. 46.
*	*b.*	——	xix. 21	Par. xii. 75.
	a.	——	xxi. 9 (*or* ‖ in Mark & Luke) .	Purg. xxx. 19.
	b.	——	xxi. 12 (*or* ‖ in other Evangg.) .	Par. xviii. 121, 122.
	b.	——	xxi. 13 (*or* ‖ s. Cf. Jer. vii. 11)	Par. xxii. 77.
	b.	——	xxi. 41	Epist. v. 2. l. 33.
	c.	——	xxii. 21	Purg. vi. 92, 93.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Conv. IV. ix. l. 167.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Epist. v. 9. l. 153.
	a.	——	xxii. 30	Purg. xix. 137.

	c.	Matt.	xxiv. 21	Par. vii. 112-114[1].
	b.	——	xxv. 25	Mon. I. i. l. 15.
	a.	——	xxv. 34	Purg. xxvii. 58.
	b.	——	xxvi. 24	Inf. v. 7.
	a.	——	xxvi. 33, 35 (& ‖ in Mark)	Mon. III. ix. ll. 92 *seqq.*
	a.	——	xxvi. 53	Conv. II. vi. l. 26.
*	*c.*	——	xxvi. 73	Inf. x. 25.
	b.	——	xxvii. 34, 38–41	Purg. xx. 88-91.
	b.	——	xxvii. 45	Par. xxvii. 35, 36.
	b.	——		Par. xxix. 97.
	a.	——	xxvii. 46	Purg. xxiii. 74.
*	*c.*	——	xxvii. 46, 50	Par. xi. 32.
	b.	——	xxvii. 51	Inf. xii. 40–45.
	b.	——		Inf. xxi. 112-114[2].
	b.	——		Par. vii. 48.
	a.	——	xxviii. 2, 3	Conv. IV. xxii. ll. 170 *seqq.*
	a.	——	xxviii. 20	Mon. III. iii. l. 84.
	c.	Mark	ix. 2	Purg. xxix. 66.
	a.	——	xi. 10	V. N. xxiii. l. 55.
	a.	——	xiv. 29	Mon. III. ix. l. 98.
	a.	——	xvi. 1–7	Conv. IV. xxii. ll. 148 *seqq.* & ll. 180 *seqq.*
	b.	Luke	i. 26	Par. ix. 138.
	b.	——	i. 26, 27	Conv. II. vi. ll. 23–25.
	a.	——	i. 28, 42	Purg. xxix. 85, 86.
	a.	——	i. 28	Par. xxxii. 94, 95.
	b.	——	i. 28–38	Purg. x. 34–45.
	b.	——		Par. xiv. 36.
	b.	——		Par. xvi. 34.
	a.	——	i. 34	Purg. xxv. 128.
	b.	——	i. 39	Purg. xviii. 100.
	b.	——	i. 47	Epist. vii. 2. l. 44.
*	*c.*	——	i. 78	Par. xi. 54.
	b.	——	i. 79	Conv. I. xiii. l. 87.
	c.	——	i. 80	Par. xviii. 134.
	a.	——	ii. 1	Mon. II. ix. l. 101.
	a.	——		Mon. II. xii. l. 42.
	a.	——		Conv. IV. v. l. 64.
	a.	——		Epist. vii. 3. l. 64.
	a.	——	ii. 1, 14 (?)	Mon. I. xvi. l. 16.
	b.	——	ii. 7	Purg. xx. 22–24.
	a.	——	ii. 9, 14	Purg. xx. 136, 139, 140.
	c.	——	ii. 13 ('militia coelestis')	Par. xviii. 124.
	a.	——	ii. 13, 14	Mon. I. iv. l. 23.
	b.	——	ii. 46-48	Purg. xv. 87–92.
	c.	——	vi. 44	Purg. xvi. 114.
	a.	——	vii. 19	Epist. vii. 2. l. 31.

[1] Note especially '*fuit* . . . *neque fiet*' in comparison with '*fu o fie*' in l. 114. [2] See *Time Reff. in Div. Com.* pp. 46 *seqq.*

	c.	Luke	ix. 62	Purg. ix. 132.
	a.	——	x. 4 (*or* ix. 3)	Mon. III. x. l. 112.
	c.	——	x. 7, 8	Par. xxi. 129.
*	*b.*	——	x. 18	Purg. xii. 26, 27.
*	*a.*	——	x. 41, 42	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 94 *seqq.*
	a.	——	xi. 17	Mon. I. v. l. 60.
	b.	——	xi. 27	Inf. viii. 45.
	c.	——	xvi. 2	Inf. xxii. 54.
	a.	——	xvi. 9	Conv. IV. xi. l. 112.
	c.	——	xvi. 24, 25	Inf. xxx. 62, 63.
	c.	——	xviii. 13	Purg. ix. 111.
*	*c.*	——	. . . . .	Purg. x. 120.
	c.	——	. . . . .	Par. xxii. 108.
	b.	——	xix. 38	Epist. viii. 11. l. 186.
*	*c.*	——	xxi. 25 (comp. John xvi. 33) .	Purg. vi. 109.
	a.	——	xxi. 28	Epist. v. 5. l. 70.
	a.	——	xxii. 7	Mon. III. ix. l. 25.
	a.	——	xxii. 14	Mon. III. ix. l. 33.
	a.	——	xxii. 33	Mon. III. ix. l. 101.
	a.	——	xxii. 35, 36	Mon. III. ix. l. 36.
	a.	——	xxii. 38	Mon. III. ix. ll. 2 & 60.
	a.	——	xxiii. 11	Mon. II. xiii. ll. 50 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	xxiii. 44	Conv. IV. xxiii. l. 105.
	a.	——	xxiv. 13–15, 32	Purg. xxi. 7–9.
	b.	——	xxiv. 44	Par. xxiv. 136.
	a.	John	i. 1, 2	Conv. III. xiv. l. 63.
*	*a.*	——	i. 3, 4	Mon. II. ii. l. 42.
	a.	——	i. 5, 9	Conv. II. vi. l. 17.
	b.	——	i. 14	Par. xxiii. 73, 74.
	a.	——	i. 23 (& ‖ in other Evangg.) .	V. N. xxiv. l. 38.
	a.	——	i. 29	Epist. vii. 2. l. 45.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Par. xvii. 33.
	a.	——	ii. 3	Purg. xiii. 29.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Purg. xxii. 142–144.
	b.	——	ii. 14, 15	Epist. viii. 4. ll. 56 *seqq.*
	b.	——	iii. 5	Epist. viii. 7. l. 108.
*	*b.*	——	iii. 16 (?)	Par. xxvi. 43–45.
	c.	——	iii. 16, 18	Epist. vii. 3. l. 68.
	b.	——	iv. 13	Purg. xxi. 1–3.
	a.	——	iv. 44 (*or* ‖ in other Evangg.) .	Conv. I. iv. l. 81.
	b.	——	vi. 13	Conv. I. xiii. ll. 82–84.
	b.	——	vi. 31, 32	Par. xii. 84.
	b.	——	vi. 37 (?)	Purg. iii. 122, 123.
	a.	——	viii. 21	Quaest. xxii. l. 20.
	b.	——	viii. 44	Inf. xxiii. 143, 144.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Mon. III. iii. l. 47.
	b.	——	ix. 17 *seqq.*	Epist. viii. 5. l. 78.
	a.	——	x. 7, 9	Mon. II. viii. l. 43.
	b.	——	xi. 39	Conv. IV. vii. l. 41.
	b.	——	xi. 49, 50; *or* xviii. 14	Inf. xxiii. 115–117.

	b.	John	xi. 49–52	Mon. II. xiii. l. 51.
	c.	——	xii. 35 (comp. ix. 4)	Purg. vii. 44.
	a.	——	xiii. 6, 8	Mon. III. ix. ll. 103 *seqq.*
	a.	——	xiii. 15	Mon. III. xv. l. 20.
	c.	——	xiii. 23	Par. xxv. 112, 113.
*	*c.*	——	xiv. 6	Par. vii. 39.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Conv. II. ix. l. 115.
	a.	——	xiv. 27	Conv. II. xv. l. 171.
	c.	——	. . . . .	Epist. vii. 1. l. 2.
	a.	——	xv. 19	Epist. iv. 5. l. 56.
	a.	——	xvi. 16	Purg. xxxiii. 10–12.
	a.	——	xvii. 3	Epist. x. 33. l. 615.
	a.	——	xvii. 4	Mon. III. xiv. l. 23.
	a.	——	xviii. 10 (& ‖ in other Evangg.)	Mon. III. ix. ll. 108–110.
	b.	——	xviii. 13	Inf. xxiii. 121.
	a.	——	xviii. 14	Inf. xxiii. 115–117.
	a.	——	xviii. 36	Mon. III. xv. l. 28.
	a.	——	xix. 10, 11	Epist. v. 10. ll. 157, 158.
	b.	——	xix. 23	Mon. I. xvi. l. 23.
	a.	——	xix. 23, 24, 34	Mon. III. x. ll. 44–46.
	c.	——	xix. 27	Par. xxv. 114.
	a.	——	xix. 30	Mon. II. xiii. l. 26.
*	*b.*	——	xx. 3–5	Par. xxiv. 125–126.
	a.	——	xx. 5, 6	Mon. III. ix. l. 111–114.
	a.	——	xx. 23	Mon. III. viii. ll. 2–8.
	a.	——	xxi. 7	Mon. III. ix. l. 115.
	a.	——	xxi. 15–17	Epist. viii. 2. l. 20.
	a.	——	xxi. 19	Mon. III. xv. ll. 24-26.
	a.	——	xxi. 21	Mon. III. ix. l. 120.
	c.	——	xxi. 22, 23	Par. xxv. 121–6.
	a.	Acts	i. 1	Mon. III. ix. l. 138.
	b.	——	i. 23–26	Inf. xix. 94–96.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Mon. II. viii. l. 70.
	b.	——	iii. 6	Par. xxii. 88.
	c.	——	iv. 12	Par. xix. 104.
	b.	——	v. 1–10	Purg. xx. 112.
*	*b.*	——	vii. 54 *seqq.*	Purg. xv. 106–114.
	b.	——	viii. 18 *seqq.*	Inf. xix. 1–4.
	a.	——	ix. 5	Epist. v. 4. l. 68.
	c.	——	. . . . .	Inf. ix. 94–97.
	b.	——	ix. 15	Inf. ii. 28.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Par. xxi. 127.
	b.	——	ix. 17	Par. xxvi. 12.
	a.	——	xxv. 10	Mon. III. xiii. l. 43.
	a.	——	xxvii. 24	Mon. III. xiii. l. 46.
	a.	——	xxviii. 19	Mon. III. xiii. l. 49.
	a.	Romans	i. 20	Mon. II. ii. l. 72.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Epist. v. 8. l. 120.
	b.	——	i. 28	Epist. vii. 7. l. 172.

a.	Romans	ii. 11[1]	Conv. IV. xx. l. 29.
a.	——	ii. 28, 29	Conv. IV. xxviii. ll. 75–81.
c.	——	v. 12	Par. vii. 25 *seqq.*; 85, 86.
a.	——		Mon. II. xiii. l. 8.
c.	——	vii. 3	Mon. III. viii. ll. 45, 46.
b.	——	vii. 23	Epist. vi. 5. l. 154.
b.	——	viii. 17	Mon. III. iii. l. 68.
c.	——	ix. 5	V. N. xliii. l. 17.
b.	——	ix. 10–13	Par. viii. 130, 131.
* *a.*	——		Par. xxxii. 67–69.
a.	——	xi. 33	Mon. II. ix. l. 75.
a.	——		Conv. IV. xxi. l. 56.
a.	——		Quaest. xxii. l. 15.
a.	——	xii. 3	Conv. IV. xiii. l. 81.
a.	——	xiii. 2	Epist. v. 4. l. 64.
b.	——		Epist. vii. 7. l. 165.
c.	1 Cor.	i. 24	Par. xxiii. 37.
a.	——	iii. 11	Mon. III. x. l. 50.
a.	——	ix. 24	Conv. IV. xxii. l. 56.
c.	——	ix. 24 (comp. Phil. iii. 14)	Mon. I. i. l. 34.
c.	——	x. 11 (comp. Heb. ix. 26)	Conv. II. xv. l. 115.
a.	——	xv. 10	Epist. viii. 5. ll. 74, 75.
c.	——	xv. 52[2]	Purg. xxx. 13, 14.
c.	2 Cor.	ii. 14–16	Par. xxiii. 75.
b.	——	vi. 2	Epist. v. 1. l. 1.
* *b.*	——	xii. 2–4	Inf. ii. 28–30.
b.	——	xii. 2, 3	Par. i. 73–75.
a.	——	xii. 3, 4	Epist. x. 28. ll. 540–4.
b.	——	xii. 4	Par. i. 6.
b.	——	xii. 11	Epist. viii. 9. l. 133.
a.	Gal.	iv. 4	Mon. I. xvi. l. 18.
c.	——	vi. 2 (?)	Purg. xiii. 59.
c.	——	vi. 8	Purg. xiv. 85.
a.	Ephes.	i. 5–8	Mon. II. xiii. ll. 16 *seqq.*
c.	——	ii. 2	Purg. v. 112–114.
a.	——	iv. 10	Epist. x. 27. l. 517.
a.	——	iv. 17	Epist. v. 10. l. 160.
a.	Philip.	i. 23	Mon. III. xiii. l. 57.
b.	Colos.	i. 13, 14	Mon. III. i. l. 26.
* *a.*	——	iii. 20	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 171.
c.	——	iv. 14	Purg. xxix. 136–138.
a.	1 Thess.	v. 8	Mon. III. i. l. 22.
a.	2 Tim.	iv. 8	Mon. II. xi. l. 69.
a.	Heb.	i. 1	Conv. II. vi. l. 6.
c.	——	x. 20	Par. xxiii. 38.
a.	——	xi. 1	Par. xxiv. 64, 65.
a.	——	xi. 6	Mon. II. viii. l. 36.

[1] The same words occur in several other passages of Scripture. [2] Comp. also *rivestita* in l. 15 with *induere* in verses 53, 54.

	c.	Heb.	xi. 6	Purg. xxii. 60.
	c.	——		Par. xxiv. 90[1].
	c.	——	xi. 13	Purg. xiii. 96.
	c.	——	xii. 22	Par. xxv. 56.
	a.	James	i. 5	Mon. I. i. l. 38.
	c.	——	i. 5, 17	Par. xxv. 29, 30.
	a.	——	i. 17	Conv. IV. xx. l. 51.
	c.	——	iii. 6	Inf. xxvi. 42.
	a.	——	v. 7[2]	Conv. IV. ii. ll. 83–87.
	c.	1 Peter	i. 12	Purg. xxxii. 74.
	a.	——	ii. 17	Epist. v. 10. ll. 165, 6.
	c.	——	iii. 15[3]	Par. xxiv. 49–51.
	c.	——	v. 8	Purg. viii. 95 (comp. xi. 20).
	c.	2 Peter	iii. 15	Par. xxiv. 62[4].
*	*c.*	Jude	12	Purg. xxiv. 4.
	a.	Rev.	i. 8	Epist. x. 33. l. 625.
	c.	——		Par. xxvi. 17.
	b.	——	i. 11	Purg. xxxii. 104, 105.
	b.	——	i. 12	Purg. xxix. 43, 50.
*	*c.*	——	iii. 15, 16	Inf. iii. 34–51.
	c.	——	iv. 3[5] (*or* Ezek. i. 28)	Purg. xxix. 78.
	b.	——	iv. 4	Purg. xxix. 65, 83.
	a.	——	iv. 6–8	Purg. xxix. 92–95.
	b.	——	iv. 8	Par. xxvi. 69.
	b.	——	v. 5	Epist. v. 1. l. 17.
	b.	——	vii. 9, 13	Par. xxv. 94, 95.
	c.	——		Par. xxx. 129.
	c.	——	x. 9, 10	Purg. xxxii. 44–45.
*	*b.*	——	xii. 8, 9	Inf. xxxiv. 121.
	b.	——	xiii. 1	Purg. xxxii. 142–147.
	c.	——	xiii. 16; xx. 4	Purg. ix. 112.
	c.	——	xiv. 3	Purg. xxxii. 61, 62.
	b.	——	xvii. 1 *seqq.*	Purg. xxxii. 148 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	xvii. 1–3	Inf. xix. 106–111.
	b.	——	xvii. 8 *fin.*	Purg. xxxiii. 35.
	c.	——	xix. 2	Inf. xix. 12 (comp. ll. 2–4; 108).
	b.	——	xix. 9	Par. xxiv. 1.
	b.	——	xix. 10 (*or* xxii. 9)	Purg. xix. 133–135.
	c.	——	xx. 12	Par. xix. 113.

[1] Comp. Romans xiv. 23; but, as Hebrews xi. is quoted just before, the above is probably the passage in Dante's mind. [2] Note that Dante quotes the Vulgate quite accurately. There is nothing about 'rain' there, as in E. V. [3] This reference (as well as that in l. 62) is the more probable, because S. Peter is the questioner; as the Epistles of SS. James and John are quoted when they are in a similar position. [4] See note on ll. 49–51. [5] Both Chapters are evidently referred to several times in this Canto, see especially ll. 100 *seqq.*

	c.	Rev.	xxi. 8	Inf. i. 117[1].
	c.	——	. . . . .	Epist. vi. 2. l. 29.

ARISTOTLE.

	a.	Categ.	i. *init.* (1 *a.* 1–4) . . .	Quaest. xii. l. 56.
	a.	——	viii. (10 *a.* 11)	Quaest. ii. l. 5.
	b.	——	x. *fin.* (13 *b.* 33–35) . .	Par. vi. 21.
	b.	——	xii. *init.* (14 *a.* 26 *seqq.* & *b.* 10 *seqq.*) . . .	Mon. I. xv. l. 3.
	a.	——	xii. (14 *b.* 18–22) . . .	Mon. III. xv. ll. 56–59.
*	*c.*	Anal. Pr. I.	xvi. (35 *b.* 23 *seqq.*) . .	Par. xiii. 98, 99.
	a.	——	xxv. (41 *b.* 36) (?) . .	Mon. III. vii. ll. 17–20.
	a.	——	xli. (49 *b.* 34 *seqq.*) . .	Quaest. xix. ll. 18–20.
	b.	—— II.	ii. (53 *b.* 6–10 & 25–7) .	Mon. III. ii. l. 17.
*	*b.*		. . .	Conv. IV. ix. l. 57.
*	*c.*	——	xxi. (67 *a.* 15)[2] . . .	Mon. I. xii. l. 15.
	c.	Anal. Post. II.	vii. (93 *a.* 20)	Quaest. xx. ll. 4–6.
*	*b.*	Soph. Elenc.	xi. (171 *b.* 16 & 172 *a.* 4)	Par. xiii. 125.
	a.	——	xviii. *init.* (176 *b.* 29) .	Mon. III. iv. l. 25.
	a.	Phys. I.	i. (184 *a.* 12–14) . . .	V. El. II. x. ll. 6–9.
*	*a.*	——	. . . .	Conv. III. xi. l. 6.
	a.	——	i. (184 *a.* 16 *seqq.*) . .	Conv. II. i. l. 107.
	a.	——	. . . .	Quaest. xx. l. 23.
	a.	——	ii. (185 *a.* 1–3)	Conv. IV. xv. l. 162.
	c.	——	. . . .	Mon. III. iii. ll. 122–124.
	a.	——	. . . .	Quaest. xi. l. 11.
*	*a.*	——	iii. *init.* (186 *a.* 7) . . .	Mon. III. iv. 30–33.
*	*b.*	——	. . .	Par. xiii. 125.
*	*b.*	—— II.	i. (192 *b.* 36)	Par. i. 141[3].
	a.	——	i. (193 *b.* 6 *seqq.*) . . .	Mon. III. xv. ll. 11–14.
*	*a.*	——	ii. (194 *a.* 21)[4]	Inf. xi. 101 *seqq.*
	a.	——	ii. (194 *a.* 28)	Mon. II. vii. l. 40.
*	*a.*	——	ii. *fin.* (194 *b.* 13)[5] . .	Mon. I. ix. l. 6.
*	*b.*	——	. . . .	Par. xxii. 116.
*	*b.*	——	. . . .	Par. xxvii. 137, 138.
	a.	——	viii. (199 *a.* 15) . . .	Inf. xi. 101 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	viii. (199 *a.* 33 *seqq.*) . .	Par. xiii. 76–78.
	a.	—— III.	i. (*esp.* 200 *b.* 12–21) . .	Conv. IV. ix. ll. 24–27.
	a.	—— IV.	iv. (211 *b.* 10 *seqq.*) . .	Epist. x. 25. l. 460.
	a.	——	xi. (220 *a.* 25)	Conv. IV. ii. l. 47.
*	*a.*	—— V.	i. *fin.* (225 *b.* 7–9)[6] . .	Conv. II. xv. ll. 40–42.
	a.	—— VII.	ii. *init.* (243 *a.* 3–6) . .	Conv. IV. x. l. 90.

[1] Especially if the passage be rightly (as I believe) explained to mean 'how each proclaims (or sets forth) the second death,' see '*Textual Criticism*,' p. 7. [2] And many other places in Aristotle. [3] See also several other passages in Dante quoted under Nic. Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20). [4] Comp. II. viii. (199 *a.* 15) & Meteor. IV. iii. (381 *b.* 6). [5] Comp. Metaph. Λ. v. (1071 *a.* 13–16). [6] Comp. Phys. VII. ii. (243 *a.* 6–8).

	a.	Phys. VII.	iii. (246 *a.* 13–16) . . .	Conv. IV. xvi. ll. 77 *seqq.*
	c.	——	. . .	Mon. III. xv. 1.
*	*c.*	——VIII.	i, ii. (*esp.* 251 *b.* 10–15) . .	Par. xiii. 100.
	a.	De Coelo, I.	ii. *init.* (268 *b.* 11–16) Comp. vii. *fin.* (276 *a.* 16, 17) .	Conv. IV. ix. ll. 24–27.
	a.	——	ii. *fin.* (269 *b.* 16) . . .	Epist. x. 27. l. 511.
*	*a.*	——	iii. (270 *b.* 5–9) Comp. ix. (278 *b.* 14, 15) . . .	Conv. II. iv. l. 33.
	a.	——	iv. (271 *a.* 33)[1]	Quaest. xiii. l. 41.
	b.	——	. . . .	Mon. I. iii. l. 22 & xiv. l. 12.
	a.	——	viii. (276 *a.* 18; & 277 *a.* 11, *b.* 13, 27)	Conv. II. v. ll. 13 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	viii. (277 *b.* 14)	Conv. III. iii. l. 9.
*	*b.*	—— II.	iv. (287 *b.* 4–14)	Quaest. xiii. ll. 12–30.
	a.	——	v. (287 *b.* 26–31)	Quaest. xxi. l. 55.
	a.	——	viii. (289 *b.* 5, 6)	Conv. III. v. ll. 53 *seqq.*
	a.	——	viii. (289 *b.* 30–34) . . .	Conv. III. ix. ll. 107–114.
*	*b.*	——	x. (291 *a.* 31)[2]	Conv. II. iii. ll. 19 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	xii. (292 *a.* 4)	Conv. II. iii. l. 60.
*	*a.*	——	xii. (292 *a.* 10 *seqq.*) . . .	Conv. II. iii. l. 29.
	a.	——	xii. (292 *b.* 20)	Conv. III. v. ll. 53 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	xiii. (293 *a.* 20 to *b.* 3 & *b.* 20, 30 *seqq.*)	Conv. III. v. ll. 29–54[3].
*	*b.*	——	xiii. (293 *a.* 30)	Quaest. iv. *init.* & xxiii. l. 14.
	b.	——	xiii. (293 *b.* 30–32) . . .	Conv. III. v. ll. 45 *seqq.*
	b.	——	xiv. (296 *b.* 9–18)	Quaest. xvi. ll. 51–55.
	a.	——	xiv. (296 *b.* 15, 22) . . .	Conv. III. v. ll. 53 *seqq.*
	b.	—— III.	vi. (304 *b.* 26)	Par. vii. 124.
	a.	—— IV.	i. (307 *b.* 31)	Quaest. xii. l. 44.
	c.	——	i. (308 *a.* 16, 30)	Inf. xxxiv. 111.
	a.	De Gen. et Cor. I.	ii. (317 *a.* 25 *seqq.*)[4].	Conv. IV. x. ll. 86–91.
	b.	——	iii. (319 *a.* 21) . .	Epist. iv. 2. l. 23.
	a.	——	vi. (322 *b.* 22–29) .	Conv. III. x. ll. 13–17.
*	*b.*	—— II.	ii. *fin.* and iii. *init.* (330 *a.* 24... *b.* 7)	Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 113 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	iv. (331 *a.* 29–32) .	Conv. IV. xviii. l. 40.
	b.	——	x. (336 *a.* 32)[5]	Par. x. 14, 15.
*	*b.*	Meteor. I.	iii. (340 *b.* 13); add iv. (341 *b.* 23 *seqq.*) & v. (342 *b.* 1) .	Conv. II. xiv. l. 169.
*	*c.*	——	iii. (341 *a.* 1)	Purg. xxviii. 97–102.
*	*c.*	——	iv. (341 *b.* 1 *seqq.*) . . .	Purg. v. 37–39.
*	*b.*	——	viii. *init.* (345 *a.* 11 *seqq.*) .	Conv. II. xv. ll. 45 *seqq.*
	c.	——		Par. xiv. 97–99.
	c.	——	viii. (345 *a.* 15)	Inf. xvii. 107, 8.
*	*c.*	——	ix. (346 *b.* 23–31)[6] . . .	Conv. IV. xviii. l. 40.

[1] And very many other places. [2] Comp. *ib.* 292 *a.* 7–9. [3] See note on this passage under 'Plato,' p. 160. [4] Cf. c. iv. (319 *b.* 8 *seqq.*). [5] Comp. Metaph. Λ. v. (1071 *a.* 15, 16). [6] Comp. II. iv (360 *a.* 20, 21 and *b.* 30–35), &c.

	a.	Meteor.	I.	ix. (346 *b.* 23–31) . . .	Quaest. xxiii. ll. 44–47.
*	*c.*	——		. . .	Purg. v. 109–111.
*	*c.*	——		xiii. (349 *b.* 21 *seqq.*) . .	Purg. xxviii. 121, 122.
*	*c.*	——	II.	ii. (355 *a.* 35)[1]	Conv. III. iii. l. 9.
	a.	——		ii. *fin.* (356 *a.* 33, *b.* 1)[2] .	Quaest. vi. l. 12.
*	*c.*	——		iv. (360 *b.* 30–35) . . .	Purg. xxviii. 97–99[3].
*	*c.*	——		iv. (360 *b.* 33 *seqq.*) . .	Purg. v. 116–118.
*	*c.*	——		viii. (366 *b.* 15 to 367 *a.* 4)	Purg. xxi. 56.
*	*c.*	——			Quaest. xxi. ll. 44–46.
*	*c.*	——		ix. (369 *a.* 16–21) . . .	Purg. xxxii. 109–111.
*	*c.*	——		ix. (369 *a.* 19 *seqq.*) . .	Par. xxiii. 40–42.
*	*c.*	——		ix. *fin.* (370 *a.* 25–32) . .	Purg. xxi. 49 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	III.	i. (370 *b.* 32 *seqq.*) . . .	Par. viii. 22.
*	*b.*	——		iii. *init.* (372 *b.* 15–18, 23, 4)	Par. xxviii. 23, 24.
	c.	——		iv. (373 *b.* 19–24) . . .	Purg. xxv. 91–93.
*	*b.*	De Mundo,		iii. (392 *b.* 35 *seqq.*) . .	Quaest. xx. ll. 39–54.
*	*c.*	——		vi. (397 *b.* 26 *seqq.*) . .	Par. xiii. 61–63.
	a.	De Anima,	I.	i. *init.* (402 *a.* 1. *seqq.*) .	Conv. II. xiv. l. 240.
	a.	——	II.	i. (412 *a.* 19–22) . . .	Conv. III. vi. l. 111.
*	*a.*	——		ii. (413 *a.* 22–*b* 13) . . .	Conv. IV. vii. ll. 110 *seqq.*
	a.	——		ii. (413 *b.* 11–13) . . .	Conv. III. ii. ll. 83 *seqq.*
	a.	——		ii. (413 *b.* 26)	Mon. III. xvi. l. 26.
*	*a.*	——		ii. (413 *b.* 26); *or* III. v. (430 *a.* 23)	Conv. II. ix. l. 63.
	a.	——		ii. (414 *a.* 11)	Conv. IV. xx. l. 58.
*	*b.*	——		ii. (414 *a.* 14–18) . . .	Par. xxix. 31–36.
*	*a.*	——		ii. (414 *a.* 25)	Conv. II. x. l. 66.
	a.	——		iii. (414 *b.* 28–32) . . .	Conv. IV. vii. ll. 139 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——		iv. *fin.* (416 *b.* 29) . . .	Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 69–72.
*	*b.*	——		vi. (418 *a.* 7–19); (comp. 428 *b.* 20 *seqq.*) . . .	Purg. xxix. 47, 48.
*	*b.*	——		. . .	Conv. III. ix. ll. 59–63.
*	*b.*	——		. . .	Conv. IV. viii. l. 49.
	a.	——		vii. (418 *a.* 29 & *b.* 2, 3; 419 *a.* 8)	Conv. III. ix. l. 53.
	b.	——		vii. (418 *b.* 26)	Conv. III. ix. ll. 90–93.
*	*b.*	——		xii. (424 *a.* 29)	Purg. xv. 15 (cf. viii. 36).
*	*b.*	——		. . . .	Purg. xvii. 53.
	a.	——	III.	iii. *init.* (427 *a.* 18 *seqq.*)[4]	Conv. IV. xv. l. 114.
	b.	——		iii. (427 *b.* 15, 16) . . .	Conv. III. iv. 87–91.
	b.	——		iii. (428 *b.* 3)	Conv. IV. viii. l. 51.
	b.	——		. . . .	Epist. x. 2. l. 44.
*	*b.*	——		iii. (428 *b.* 20 *seqq.*) . .	Purg. xxix. 47, 48.
*	*b.*	——		. .	Conv. III. ix. ll. 59–63.
*	*b.*	——		. .	Conv. IV. viii. l. 49.

[1] Comp. De Mundo iii. (392 *b.* 35 *seqq.*). [2] Aristotle however *h. l.* maintains that the sea is τελευτὴ μᾶλλον ὕδατος ἢ ἀρχή. [3] Comp. Inf. ix. 68. [4] Perhaps comp. c. iv. (429 *a.* 18–22).

*	*c.*	De Anima, III.	iv. (429 *a.* 22–27) ? . .	Purg. xxv. 64–66.
*	*b.*	——	iv. (429 *a.* 27 & 429 *b.* 30)	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 44.
*	*c.*	——	v. (430 *a.* 22–25) . . .	Purg. xxv. 64–66.
*	*a.*	——	ix. (432 *a.* 15, 31) ? . .	Conv. III. ii. ll. 124 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	ix. (432 *b.* 21)[1]	Par. viii. 114.
	b.	——	. . . .	Conv. III. xv. ll. 81 & 91.
	b.	——	. . . .	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 106.
*	*b.*	——	. . . .	Mon. I. x. l. 4.
*	*b.*	——	. . . .	V. El. I. ii. l. 9.
	a.	De Sens. et Sensib.	ii. (437 *b.* 11–16) .	Conv. III. ix. l. 105.
	a.	——	iii. (439 *a.* 18–21) .	Conv. III. ix. l. 53–55.
*	*c.*	De Memoria	i. (450 *a.* 25–32; & *b.* 10–29)	Par. xxix. 79–81.
	a.	De Juv. et Sen.	xvii. (479 *a.* 20) . . .	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 31.
*	*c.*	——	xviii. (479 *a.* 29 *seqq.*) .	Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 69–72.
	a.	——	xviii. (479 *a.* 30–32) . .	Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 81–87.
	c.	Hist. Anim. I.	ix. (491 *b.* 21)	Conv. III. ix. ll. 72, 92.
	c.	——	ix. (491 *b.* 28–34) . . .	Purg. xvii. 3.
*	*a.*	—— VIII.	i. *init.* (588 *a.* 25–30) .	Conv. II. ix. l. 78.
	c.	——	i. (588 *b.* 6)	Conv. III. iii. l. 21.
*	*c.*	——	i. (588 *b.* 10 *seqq.*) . .	Purg. xxv. 56.
	a.	De Part. Anim. I.	v. (644 *b.* 24–35) . . .	Conv. II. iii. l. 14.
*	*b.*	—— II.	x. (656 *b.* 16–31)[2] . .	Conv. III. ix. ll. 83–86.
	c.	—— III.	i. (661 *b.* 10)	Mon. III. xvi. l. 32.
*	*b.*	——	iv. (665 *b.* 14, 15) . . .	Mon. I. xiv. ll. 1, 15, 21.
*	*b.*	——	. . .	Quaest. xiii. l. 35.
*	*c.*	——	x. (673 *a.* 8)	Epist. x. 26. l. 504.
	c.	—— IV.	xii. (694 *a.* 15)[3] . . .	Mon. I. xiv. l. 12.
*	*c.*	De Gen. Anim. I.	ii. (716 *a.* 5–7)	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 37.
	b.	——	xviii. (724 *b.* 26)[4] . . .	Purg. xxv. 37–39.
	b.	——	xix. (726 *b.* 15–19) . .	Purg. xxv. 40, 41.
*	*c.*	——	. .	Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 39–42.
*	*b.*	——	xix. (727 *a.* 2, 25 *seqq.*) .	Purg. xxv. 45.
	b.	——	xxi. (729 *b.* 12 *seqq.*) . .	Purg. xxv. 47.
*	*c.*	—— II.	i. 16, 7 (732 *b.* 31 *seqq.*) .	Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 69–72.
*	*b.*	——	i. (735 *a.* 23–26) & iv. (738 *b.* 16)	Purg. xxv. 40.
	b.	——	iii. (736 *b.* 2)	Purg. xxv. 61.
*	*b.*	——	iii. (736 *a.* 34; *b.* 12) .	Purg. xxv. 52, 53.
*	*c.*	——	iii. (736 *b.* 27 *seqq.*) . .	Purg. xxv. 70–72.
*	*c.*	——	.	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 43.
	b.	——	iii. (736 *b.* 33 *seqq.*) . .	Conv. II. xiv. ll. 35, 36.
*	*b.*	——	iii. (737 *a.* 20–22) & iv. (739 *b.* 20 *seqq.*) . .	Purg. xxv. 49–51.

[1] Also Pol. I. ii. 10 (1253 *a.* 9), and often besides. [2] Comp. Hist. Anim. I. xi. (492 *a.* 21). [3] This sentiment occurs at least thrice besides in De Part. Anim., viz. 695 *b.* 19, 661 *b.* 24, & 691 *b.* 4; and also twice in De Gen. Anim.: 739 *b.* 20 & 744 *a.* 36. [4] And elsewhere: e. g. I. xix. (726 *a.* 26 & *b.* 3–10); II. iii. (736 *b.* 26), &c.

*	*b.*	De Gen. Anim.	II. iii. (737 *a.* 28) . . .	Purg. xxv. 45.
*	*c.*	——	iii. (737 *a.* 29) . . .	Conv. IV. xxi. 37-39.
*	*c.*	——	iv. (738 *b.* 20) . . .	
*	*c.*	——	v. (741 *a.* 6 *seqq.*) . .	
	c.	——	vi. (744 *a.* 36)[1] . . .	Mon. I. iii. l. 22, & xiv. l. 12.
	a.	——	. . .	Quaest. xiii. l. 42.
	b.	——	III. ii. (753 *b.* 28) . . .	Purg. xxv. 52, 53.
	c.	——	xi. (761 *b.* 16–21) . .	Par. i. 115.
*	*c.*	——	xi. (761 *b.* 16–21) . .	Conv. III. iii. l. 11.
*	*b.*	——	V. i. (779 *a.* 1)	Purg. xxv. 52, 53.
	c.	——	i. (780 *b.* 22–26) . .	Conv. III. ix. ll. 91–95.
	c.	——	viii. (789 *b.* 7) . . .	Mon. II. ii. l. 11.
	c.	——	viii. (789 *b.* 10–12) . .	Par. ii. 127, 128.
	c.	——	. .	Conv. I. xiii. l. 27.
	c.	——	. .	Conv. IV. iv. l. 122.
	c.	——	. .	Mon. III. vi. l. 35.
*	*b.*	Prob.	ΑΑ. xxviii. (960 *a.* 21 *seqq.*)	Purg. xv. 15.
	a.	Metaph.	A. i. *init.* (980 *a.* 22) . .	Conv. I. i. l. 1.
	b.	——	. .	Conv. III. xi. l. 62.
	b.	——	. .	Conv. III. xv. l. 73.
	a.	——	i. (980 *a.* 22–27) . .	Conv. II. xvi. l. 91.
	b.	——	i. (981 *a.* 1–7) . . .	Par. ii. 95, 6.
	c.	——	i. (981 *a.* 30 & *b.* 31) .	Mon. III. iv. l. 4[2].
	b.	——	ii. (982 *b.* 12) . . .	Quaest. xx. l. 28.
	a.	——	ii. (982 *b.* 25–27)[3] . .	Conv. III. xiv. l. 98.
	a.	——	. .	Mon. I. xii. ll. 49–52.
*	*a.*	——	v. (986 *a.* 16–21) . .	Conv. II. xiv. l. 144.
	a.	——	v. (986 *a.* 24) . . .	Mon. I. xv. l. 18.
	a.	——	A. *min.* i. (993 *b.* 9–11) .	V. N. xlii. l. 30.
	a.	——	.	Conv. II. v. l. 119[4].
	a.	——	i. (993 *b.* 22) . .	Epist. x. 16. l. 279.
	a.	——	i. (993 *b.* 30) . .	Epist. x. 5. l. 91.
	a.	——	ii. (994 *a.* 1 *seqq.*) .	Epist. x. 20. l. 371.
*	*a.*	——	Γ. vii. (1012 *a.* 23) . . .	Conv. III. xi. l. 12.
	a.	——	Z. vii. *init.* (1032 *a.* 13–27)[5]	Conv. IV. x. l. 83.
	b.	——	vii. (1032 *a.* 26–31) . .	Par. xiii. 64–66.
	c.	——	H. iv. (1044 *b.* 10–15)[6] .	Quaest. xx. ll. 25–28.
	a.	——	Θ. viii. (1049 *b.* 24) . . .	Mon. I. xiii. l. 15.
	a.	——	. . .	Mon. III. xiv. l. 46.
	a.	——	I. i. (1052 *b.* 34)	Mon. III. xii. 2.
	a.	——	Λ. i. & ii. (1069 *b.* 3 & 24)	V. N. xxv. l. 15.

[1] And also elsewhere in Bk. II. [2] This seems to explain the sense in which 'Architectus' is here used. [3] Note that Dante says here 'nel *secondo* della Metafisica' according to all the MSS. This generally with him represents A *min.* [4] Note that the illustration from the eyes of the bat (see Aristotle *l.c.*) occurs (though not as a quotation) just below, l. 128. [5] Comp. Phys. I. v. (188 *a.* 31–34). [6] And often elsewhere, but the illustration in Aristotle is generally from Eclipse of Moon, not as *h. l.* of the Sun.

	b.	Metaph. Λ.	iv. (1070 *b.* 18)	Conv. II. xiv. l. 139.
*	*b.*	——	vii. (1072 *a.* 23–28 & *b.* 3)	Par. xxiv. 130–132[1].
*	*b.*	——	& viii. (1073 *a.* 23–35)	Par. xxvi. 38.
	b.	——	vii. (1072 *b.* 13, 14) . . .	Par. xxviii. 42.
	c.	——	vii. (1073 *a.* 5–7)	Par. xxviii. 16.
	c.	——	viii. (1073 *a.* 14 *seqq.*) . .	Par. xiii. 97.
	a.	——	viii. (1073 *b.* 3–16) . . .	Conv. II. iii. l. 31.
	a.	——	viii. (1074 *a.* 14 to *b.* 3) .	Conv. II. v. l. 13[2].
	a.	——	viii. (1074 *a.* 31–35)? . .	Conv. IV. xv. ll. 52–55.
	c.	——	ix. (1074 *b.* 34)	Conv. IV. ii. ll. 156–162.
	a.	——	x. *fin.* (1076 *a.* 4) . . .	Mon. I. x. ll. 28–31.
	b.	Nic. Eth. I.	i. 4 (1094 *a.* 11)	Conv. IV. vi. ll. 61, 62.
	a.	——	ii. 2 (1094 *a.* 23)	Conv. IV. xxii. l. 15.
	a.	——	ii. 8 (1094 *b.* 8–10) . . .	Mon. II. viii. l. 17.
	c.	——	. .	Conv. I. viii. ll. 13–15.
*	*a.*	——	iii. 4 (1094 *b.* 23–25) . . .	Conv. IV. xiii. l. 74.
	a.	——	.	Quaest. xx. l. 16.
	a.	——	iii. 4 (1094 *b.* 23–25) & vii. 18 (1098 *a.* 26)	Mon. II. ii. l. 63.
	b.	——	iii. 6 (1095 *a.* 5)	Epist. x. 16. l. 274.
	c.	——	iii. 7 (1095 *a.* 6–8) . . .	Conv. I. iv. l. 11.
	a.	——	. . .	Conv. IV. xvi. ll. 56–59.
	b.	——	iv. 5 (1095 *b.* 1)	Mon. II. ix. l. 40.
	a.	——	iv. 6, 7 (1095 *b.* 4 *seqq.*) .	Conv. IV. xv. ll. 141–149.
	c.	——	v. 3 (1095 *b.* 19–22)[3] . .	Purg. xvi. 100–102.
	a.	——	vi. 1 (1096 *a.* 14–17) . .	Conv. III. xiv. ll. 79 *seqq.*
	a.	——	. . .	Conv. IV. viii. l. 142.
	a.	——	. . .	Mon. III. i. ll. 17, 18.
	a.	——	. . .	Epist. viii. 5. l. 84.
	c.	——	vi. 5 (1096 *b.* 1)[4]	Conv. IV. xv. l. 55.
	c.	——	vii. 11 (1097 *b.* 28) . . .	Conv. IV. vi. ll. 64–66.
	c.	——	vii. 12 (1097 *b.* 33 *seqq.*) .	Mon. I. iii. ll. 45–55.
	a.	——	vii. 15 (1098 *a.* 16–18) . .	Conv. III. xv. l. 130.
	a.	——	. .	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 76.
	a.	——	vii. 16 (1098 *a.* 18) . . .	Conv. I. ix. ll. 61, 62.
	a.	——	vii. 21 (1098 *b.* 3, 4) . .	Quaest. xi. l. 14.
	a.	——	vii. 21 (1098 *b.* 7) . . .	Mon. I. iii. l. 3.
	a.	——	viii. 7 (1098 *b.* 28, 29)[5] . .	Conv. IV. iii. l. 64.
	a.	——	. .	Conv. IV. viii. l. 43.
*	*b.*	——	x. 11 (1100 *b.* 21)	Par. xvii. 24.
*	*b.*	——	x. 14 (1101 *a.* 7)	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 73.
	c.	——	xii. 6 *init.* (1101 *b.* 31) & xiii. 20 *fin.* (1103 *a.* 9) .	Conv. IV. xviii. ll. 23–25.
	a.	——	xiii. 15–17 (1102 *b.* 13 *seqq.*)	Quaest. xviii. l. 68.
*	*b.*	——	xiii. 20 (1103 *a.* 6)[6] . . .	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 79–84.

[1] Comp. for the sentiment Conv. II. vi. ll. 151–4. 'Solo intendendo,' &c. [2] Add 1073 *a.* 34 to *b.* 3. [3] Comp. X. vi. 3, 4 (1176 *b.* 16). [4] Query: is this the source of the reference to Plato? Comp. Ar. Metaph. Λ viii. (1074 *a.* 31–35). [5] Comp. also X. ii. 4 (1172 *b.* 36 *seqq.*). [6] Comp. VI. xiii. 6 (1144 *b.* 30–32) & X. viii. 3. (1178 *a.* 16–19).

*	*b.*	Nic. Eth.	II. i. 1 (1103 *a.* 14–17) . . .	Conv. I. xi. ll. 46 *seqq.*
	b.	——	i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20)[1]	Purg. xviii. 28.
*	*b.*	——	. . . .	Par. i. 141.
	b.	——	. . . .	Par. iv. 77, 78.
	b.	——	. . . .	Par. xxiii. 40–42.
	b.	——	. . . .	Mon. I. xv. ll. 38 *seqq.*
	b.	——	. . . .	Mon. III. vii. l. 30.
	b.	——	. . . .	Conv. IV. ix. l. 55.
	a.	——	i. 4, 5 (1103 *a.* 31 *seqq.*) .	Conv. III. viii. ll. 164–170.
	a.	——	i. 7, 8 (1103 *b.* 13 *seqq.*) .	Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 126 *seqq.*
	a.	——	iii. 1 (1104 *b.* 4 *seqq.*)[2] .	Conv. III. viii. ll. 165–169.
	c.	——	. .	Par. xviii. 58–60.
	c.	——	iii. 5 (1104 *b.* 21, 22) . .	Conv. IV. xxvi. ll. 38–41.
	c.	——	vi. 2, 3 (1106 *a.* 15 *seqq.*)	Conv. I. v. ll. 71 *seqq.*
	b.	——	vi. 15 (1106 *b.* 36) . . .	Conv. IV. vi. l. 120.
	a.	——	. . .	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 9 & 71.
	a.	——	. . .	Conv. IV. xx. l. 9.
	a.	——	. . .	Conv. Canz. III. ll. 85 *seqq.*
	a.	——	vii. 4 (1107 *b.* 9) . . .	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 39.
	a.	——	vii. 6 (1107 *b.* 16 *seqq.*) .	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 42.
	a.	——	vii. 8 (1107 *b.* 22 *seqq.*) .	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 44–49.
	a.	——	III. i. 1 (1109 *b.* 31–1110 *a.* 3)	Conv. III. iv. ll. 54–59.
	b.	——	i. 12 (1110 *b.* 16) . . .	Par. iv. 73.
	b.	——	. . .	Conv. III. iv. ll. 57–59.
	b.	——	i. 4, 8 (1110 *a.* 4 *seqq.* & 26)	Par. iv. 100–108.
	b.	——	i. 5, 6 (1110 *a.* 8 *seqq.*)[3] .	Par. iv. 106–111.
*	*b.*	——	iii. 6 (1112 *a.* 28) . . .	Mon. III. iii. l. 13.
	b.	——	v. 15 (1114 *a.* 23) . . .	Conv. III. iv. l. 62.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 4 (1115 *a.* 17, 18) . .	Inf. ii. 88, 89.
*	*b.*	——	x. 8 (1118 *a.* 26) . . .	Conv. III. iii. l. 82.
	c.	——	xi. 1 (1118 *b.* 8) . . .	Conv. III. viii. ll. 160 *seqq.*
	c.	——	xi. 3, 4 (1118 *b.* 15–22) .	Purg. xvii. 94 *seqq.*
	a.	——	xi. 8 (1119 *a.* 16) . . .	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 37, 38.
*	*a.*	——	xii. 2 (1119 *a.* 23) . .	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 33.
	c.	——	xii. 8, 9 (1119 *b.* 12 *seqq.*)	Conv. IV. xxvi. ll. 46–49.
*	*b.*	——	IV. i. 5 (1120 *a.* 1–3) . . .	Inf. xi. 43, 44.
	a.	——	i. 8 (1120 *a.* 13–15) . .	Mon. III. x. l. 100.
	c.	——	i. 11 (1120 *a.* 21, 22) . .	Conv. IV. xiii. ll. 137, 138.
*	*a.*	——	i. 12 (1120 *a.* 24) . . .	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 110.
	c.	——	i. 17 (1120 *b.* 1–3) . . .	Conv. IV. xiii. ll. 147–149.
	c.	——	i. 20 (1120 *b.* 13) . . .	Conv. I. iii. ll. 63–65.
	c.	——	. . .	Conv. III. ix. ll. 39, 40.
	c.	——	i. 21 (1120 *b.* 17) . . .	Conv. IV. xi. ll. 103 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	iii. 3, 7 (1123 *b.* 2 & 9) .	Conv. I. xi. ll. 140, 141.
	b.	——	iii. 15 (1123 *b.* 35) . . .	Mon. II. iii. l. 10.

[1] Comp. Phys. II. i. (192 *b.* 36), Magn. Mor. I. vi. (1186 *a.* 4 *seqq.*), and several other places in Aristotle. [2] Comp. I. viii. 12 (1099 *a.* 15).
[3] Note especially *mischia* (l. 107) and *assoluta* (l. 109), corresponding with *μικταὶ* and *ἁπλῶς l. c.*

	c.	Nic. Eth. IV.	iii. 35 (1125 *a.* 25–27) .	Inf. ii. 45–47.
*	*a.*	——	v. 1, 5, 6 (1125 *b.* 26; 1126 *a.* 4–8)	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 50–52.
*	*a.*	——	vi. 1 (1126 *b.* 11) . . .	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 54.
	a.	——	vii. 4 (1127 *a.* 24)[1] . .	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 56.
	a.	——	viii. 1 (1127 *b.* 33) . .	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 60.
	c.	——	viii. 10 (1128 *a.* 32) . .	Conv. IV. xxvi. ll. 131, 132.
	b.	——	ix. 1 (1128 *b.* 10, 11)[2] .	Conv. IV. xix. l. 80.
	c.	——	ix. 3 (1128 *b.* 16) . . .	Conv. IV. xxv. l. 27.
*	*a.*	——	ix. 3, 4 (1128 *b.* 19–23) .	Conv. IV. xix. l. 83.
*	*a.*	——	V. . . . ?	Conv. I. xii. l. 75.
*	*c.*	——	i. 12 (1129 *b.* 11–14) ? .	Conv. I. vii. l. 59.
	b.	——	i. 3 (1129 *a.* 8)	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 63.
	b.	——	i. 15, 17, 20 (1129 *b.* 26; 1130 *a.* 3, 4; 1130 *a.* 13)	Mon. I. xi. l. 48, 49.
	a.	——	ii. 5 (1130 *a.* 31) . . .	Mon. I. xi. l. 70.
*	*a.*	——	ii. 10, 11 (1130 *b.* 22–24)[3] ?	Conv. II. xv. l. 128.
	c.	——	iv. 2 (1131 *b.* 27, 28) . .	Conv. IV. xi. l. 54.
	a.	——	x. 6 (1137 *b.* 26) . . .	Mon. I. xiv. ll. 35–38.
*	*b.*	——	VI. i. 6 (1139 *a.* 12, 13) . .	Conv. III. ii. ll. 126–128.
	c.	——	ii. 2 (1139 *a.* 21, 22) . .	Conv. IV. xxvi. l. 37.
	a.	——	ii. 3 (1139 *a.* 27, 28) . .	Conv. II. xiv. l. 42.
	b.	——	ii. 6 (1139 *b.* 11)[4] . . .	Mon. III. vi. l. 52.
	a.	——	iii. 2, 4 (1139 *b.* 20; 31–34)	Conv. IV. xii. l. 127[5].
	a.	——	ix. 5 (1142 *b.* 22–24) .	Mon. II. vi. ll. 46–49.
	c.	——	ix. 7 (1142 *b.* 31) . . .	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 57.
*	*b.*	——	xii. 9 (1144 *a.* 27) . .	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 50.
*	*a.*	——	xiii. 6 (1144 *b.* 30–32) .	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 47.
*	*b.*	——	.	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 79–84.
	a.	——	VII. i. 1 (1145 *a.* 16) . . .	Inf. xi. 79–83.
	a.	——	i. 1 (1145 *a.* 20) . . .	Conv. IV. xx. l. 37.
	a.	——	i. 2 (1145 *a.* 23) . . .	Conv. III. vii. l. 89.
	a.	——	viii. 5 (1151 *a.* 24) . .	Inf. xi. 83, 84.
*	*c.*	——	x. 4 (1152 *a.* 31)[6] . .	Conv. III. viii. l. 181.
	a.	——	xiv. 3 (1154 *a.* 22 *seqq.*) ?	Conv. IV. ii. l. 139.
	a.	——	VIII. i. 1 (1155 *a.* 5) . . .	Conv. IV. xxv. l. 7.
	c.	——	i. 3 (1155 *a.* 22) . . .	Conv. I. i. l. 55.
	b.	——	ii. 1 (1155 *b.* 19) & iii. 1, 2 (1156 *a.* 10–16) . .	Epist. x. 2. ll. 25 *seqq.*
	a.	——	. . .	Conv. III. xi. ll. 80, 90.
	a.	——	ii. 4 (1156 *a.* 2–4) . .	Conv. III. xi. l. 75.
	a.	——	iii. 2, 6 (1156 *a.* 17 & *b.* 7–11)	Conv. III. xi. l. 91.

[1] Perhaps comp. the phrase ἡ τῆς ἀλαζονείας μεσότης with *modera noi dal vantare* &c. [2] Comp. also *sup.* l. 41. [3] Apparently quoted in combination or confusion with Eth. I. ii. 5, 6 (1094 *a.* 27 *seqq.*). [4] Agathon is quoted evidently from Aristotle's citation. [5] *Certe cose* evidently = τὰ μὴ ἐνδεχόμενα ἄλλως ἔχειν, and *perfetta ragione* corresponds with ἀποδεικτική. [6] Comp. Rhet. I. xi. 3 (1370 *a.* 6, 7).

	a.	Nic. Eth.	VIII. iii. 6 (1156 *b.* 7)[1] . . .	Conv. III. iii. l. 90.
	a.	——	iii. 6, 8 (1156 *b.* 7 *seqq.* & 26 *seqq.*)	Conv. I. xii. l. 21.
	b.	——	iii. 9. (1156 *b.* 33) . . .	Conv. III. xi. ll. 114, 115.
	c.	——	vi. 1, 4 (1158 *a.* 1–6 & 20)[2] .	Conv. IV. xxv. ll. 9, 10.
	b.	——	vi. 6 (1158 *a.* 34, 35) . .	Epist. x. 2. l. 32[3].
	c.	——	vi. 7 (1158 *b.* 1 *seqq.*) & viii. 5 (1159 *b.* 2–7) . .	Conv. III. i. ll. 40 *seqq.*
	c.	——	viii. 5, 6 (1159 *b.* 2–14) .	Epist. x. 2. ll. 25–28.
	a.	——	IX. i. 1 (1163 *b.* 32)	Conv. III. i. ll. 56 *seqq.*
	a.	——	. . . .	Epist. x. 3. l. 62.
	c.	——	vii. 3 (1168 *a.* 1–3) . . .	Conv. I. iii. ll. 63–65.
	c.	——	. . .	Conv. III. ix. ll. 39, 40.
*	*a.*	——	ix. 10 (1170 *b.* 11 *seqq.*) .	Conv. III. xi. ll. 139–144.
	a.	——	X. i. 3 (1172 *a.* 34, 35) . . .	Mon. I. xiii. l. 26.
	a.	——	. . .	Mon. II. xii. l. 39.
*	*c.*	——	v. 3, 4 (1175 *b.* 1 *seqq.*) .	Conv. II. xiv. ll. 187 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	.	Purg. iv. 1 *seqq.*
	a.	——	v. 10 (1176 *a.* 16) . . .	Mon. III. xii. ll. 62–67.
	a.	——	vii. 3 & 9 (1177 *a.* 23–7 & 1178 *a.* 5–8)	Conv. III. xv. ll. 47–50.
	b.	——	vii. 4 (1177 *a.* 27 *seqq.*) & viii. 6 (1178 *b.* 3 *seqq.*) .	Conv. III. xiii. ll. 50 *seqq.*
	c.	——	vii. 7 *fin.* (1177 *b.* 25) . .	Conv. III. xv. l. 30.
*	*a.*	——	vii. 8 (1177 *b.* 31 *seqq.*) .	Conv. IV. xiii. l. 70.
*	*b.*	——	.	Quaest. xxii. l. 3.
	c.	——	vii. 9 (1178 *a.* 2–4) . . .	Conv. II. viii. ll. 24, 25.
	c.	——	. . .	Conv. III. xv. ll. 37–39.
	a.	——	vii. 9 & viii. 1 (1178 *a.* 7–9)	Conv. IV. xvii. l. 94.
	c.	——		Par. xxviii. 110, 111.
	c.	——		Conv. IV. xxii. ll. 201 *seqq.*
	b.	——	viii. 3 (1178 *a.* 16–19) . .	Conv. IV. xvii. ll. 79–84.
	a.	——	viii. 7 (1178 *b.* 7 *seqq.*) . .	Conv. II. v. ll. 91 *seqq.*
	c.	——	viii. 11 *fin.* (1179 *a.* 16) .	Conv. I. iv. ll. 17–21.
	b.	——	viii. 13 (1179 *a.* 23 *seqq.*) .	Conv. II. v. ll. 82–86.
	c.	——	.	Mon. I. viii. ll. 17–19.
	c.	——	ix. 6 *fin.* (1179 *b.* 24–26) .	Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 122–125.
	a.	——	ix. 8 (1179 *b.* 31 *seqq.*) . .	Mon. I. xv. l. 72.
	a.	Pol.	I. ii. 2 (1252 *a.* 31)	Mon. I. iii. l. 91.
*	*c.*	——	. . . .	Epist. x. 2. l. 50.
	b.	——	ii. 5–8 (1252 *b.* 13 *seqq.*)[4] .	Conv. IV. iv. ll. 10 *seqq.*
	b.	——	.	Mon. I. iii. ll. 33–36.
	a.	——	ii. 6 (1252 *b.* 20, 21) . .	Mon. I. v. l. 33.

[1] Comp. VIII. iv. 3 (1157 *a.* 20). [2] Comp. v. 2 (1157 *b.* 14, 15). [3] Here *honestate praeclaros* seems exactly to correspond with τῇ ἀρετῇ ὑπερέχηται. [4] It is evident that 'vicinanza' in Conv. and 'vicinia' in Mon. represent κώμη in Pol. *l. c.* The word ἀποικία *h. l.* twice appears as *vicinia* in *Ant. Trans.*

	a.	Pol. I.	ii. 9 (1253 *a.* 3)[1] . . .	Conv. IV. iv. l. 9.
	a.	——	. . . .	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 29.
	b.	——	. . . .	Par. viii. 116.
*	*a.*	——	ii. 10 (1253 *a.* 9)	Par. viii. 113, 4; 120.
	b.	——	. . . .	Conv. III. xv. ll. 81 & 91.
	b.	——	. . . .	V. El. I. ii. l. 8.
	a.	——	ii. 14 (1253 *a.* 25) (?) .	Mon. II. viii. l. 14.
*	*c.*	——	ii. 15, 16 (1253 *a.* 31–35)[2]	Inf. xxxi. 55–57.
	a.	——	v. 3 (1254 *a.* 28)	Conv. IV. iv. l. 46.
	a.	——	. . . .	Mon. I. v. ll. 14 *seqq.*
	a.	——	v. 11 (1255 *a.* 1, 2) . . .	Mon. II. vii. ll. 52 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	—— II.	ii. 3 (1261 *a.* 23, 24) . .	Par. viii. 118–120.
	a.	—— III.	iv. 3, 4 (1276 *b.* 30 *seqq.*) .	Mon. I. xii. l. 68.
	a.	——	vi. 3 (1278 *b.* 19)[3] . . .	Conv. IV. iv. l. 9.
	b.	——	vii. 2–5 (1279 *a.* 25 *seqq.*) .	Mon. I. xii. ll. 55–63.
	a.	—— IV.	i. 9 (1289 *a.* 13–15) . . .	Mon. I. xii. ll. 77 *seqq.*
	a.	——	viii. 9. (1294 *a.* 21, 22) . .	Mon. II. iii. l. 16.
	a.	Rhet. I.	i. 7 (1354 *a.* 31–34) . . .	Mon. I. xi. l. 75.
	c.	——	xi. 3 (1370 *a.* 6, 7) . . .	Conv. III. viii. l. 181.
	c.	——	xi. (1371 *b.* 18–20) . . .	Conv. I. ii. l. 31.
	a.	—— II.	iv. vi. vii. viii. x. xi. . .	Conv. III. viii. l. 85.
	a.	—— III.	xiv. 1 (1414 *b.* 19) . . .	Epist. x. 18. l. 296.
	b.	——	xiv. 6 (1415 *a.* 12, 13) . .	Epist. x. 18. l. 304.
	a.	De Causis, Lect. I.	*init.* (469 A.)[4] . .	Epist. x. 20. l. 380.
	a.	——	(469 B, C.) . .	Mon. I. xi. l. 132.
	b.	—— Lect. II.	(472 B.)	Mon. III. xvi. l. 17.
	a.	—— Lect. III.	(473 D, E.) . .	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 90.
	a.	—— Lect. IV.	*init.* (476 B.) . .	Conv. III. ii. l. 52.
	a.	—— Lect. VIII.	(484 D, E.) . .	Conv. III. vi. l. 41.
	a.	—— Lect. X.	*init.* (488 D.) . .	Epist. x. 21. l. 407.
	a.	—— Lect. XX.	*init.* (501 A.)[5] .	Conv. III. ii. l. 27.
	a.	——	(501 B.) . .	Conv. III. ii. l. 31.
	a.	——	(501 B.) . .	Conv. III. vii. l. 17.
	a.	——	?	Conv. III. vi. l. 114.
*	*a.*	. . . . .	?	Conv. IV. xi. l. 83.

PLATO.

*	*c.*	Timaeus 39 E, 40 A, & 69 C		Conv. II. v. ll. 21 *seqq.* & IV. xv. l. 55. Cf. Par. xiii. 97.
*	*a.*	—— 40 B[6]		Conv. III. v. l. 45.
*	*b.*	—— 41 D, E, and 42 B		Par. iv. 24, 49.
*	*b.*	——	. . . . .	Conv. II. xiv. ll. 31 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	. . . . .	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 17.
*	*b.*	—— 45 C		Conv. III. ix. ll. 100 *seqq.*

[1] Repeated Pol. III. vi. 3 (1278 *b.* 19). Comp. Nic. Eth. I. vii. 6 (1097 *b.* 11). [2] Comp. Nic. Eth. VII. vi. 7 (1150 *a.* 4, 5). [3] See also reff. under Pol. I. ii. 9. [4] The reff. are to the folio ed. of St. Thomas Aquinas, Paris, 1647. [5] Comp. Lect. XXIV. *med.* (504 A.). [6] Probably through Arist. De Coelo II. xiii (293 *b.* 30). Cf. Cic. Acad. II. xxxix. 123.

*	*c.*	Timaeus 69 C *seqq.*	Purg. iv. 5, 6.
	a.	. . . . . ?	Epist. x. 29. ll. 577–579.

HOMER.

*	*a.*	[Iliad ii. 204][1] (quoted as Aristotle) . .	Mon. I. x. l. 30.
*	*a.*	Iliad xxiv. 259	V. N. ii. l. 51.
*	*a.*	—— xxiv. 259 (quoted from Aristotle's citation)	Conv. IV. xx. l. 37.
*	*a.*	—— xxiv. 259 (quoted from Aristotle's citation)	Mon. II. iii. l. 55.
	a.	Odyssey i. 1 (quoted from Horace) . .	V. N. xxv. l. 93.
	a.	Odyssey ix. 114 (quoted from Aristotle's citation in Pol. I. ii. 7 (1252 *b.* 22), but very vaguely) . .	Mon. I. v. l. 34.

VIRGIL.

	c.	Eclog. iii. 93 (?)	Inf. vii. 84.
*	*a.*	—— iv. 5–7	Purg. xxii. 70–72.
	a.	—— iv. 6	Mon. I. xi. l. 6.
	a.	——	Epist. vii. 1. l. 22.
*	*b.*	—— iv. 55, 56	Inf. iv. 140, 141.
	c.	Georg. i. 412	Epist. v. 4. l. 60.
*	*b.*	—— ii. 122–124	Purg. xxxii. 40–42.
	c.	—— ii. 336–342 (?)	Inf. i. 39, 40.
*	*c.*	—— ii. 441 (?)	Inf. ix. 70.
*	*c.*	—— iv. 525–527	Purg. xxx. 49–51.
	a.	Aeneid i. 1	V. El. II. viii. l. 23.
	a.	—— i. 65, 76, 77	V. N. xxv. ll. 76 *seqq.*
	c.	——	Inf. ii. 80, 81.
	c.	—— i. 116, 117	Inf. xxvi. 139.
	c.	—— i. 203	Inf. xvi. 84.
	a.	—— i. 234–236	Mon. II. ix. ll. 83–86.
*	*c.*	—— i. 242 *seqq.*[2]	Inf. xxxii. 88.
*	*c.*	——	Purg. v. 75.
	a.	—— i. 278, 279	Conv. IV. iv. ll. 117–9.
	a.	—— i. 286, 287	Epist. vii. 3. ll. 62, 3.
	c.	—— i. 287	Mon. I. xi. l. 83.
*	*c.*	—— i. 323	Inf. i. 33.
*	*b.*	—— i. 342	Mon. II. iii. l. 42.
	b.	—— i. 346–364	Purg. xx. 103–105.
	c.	—— i. 372, 373	Epist. v. 8. ll. 127 *seqq.*[3]
	c.	—— i. 394	Purg. xxxii. 112.
	a.	—— i. 544, 545	Mon. II. iii. ll. 46, 47.
	c.	——	Inf. i. 73, 74.
	b.	—— i. 600–605	Epist. i. 2. ll. 40 *seqq.*
	c.	——	Par. iv. 121–123.

[1] This passage is also cited by Boethius Cons. I. Pros. v. without naming its author. [2] As explained in the note of Servius. [3] Note especially *vacet* in l. 131.

	c.	Aeneid i. 630	Conv. I. i. ll. 71 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	—— i. 664, 665	Conv. II. vi. ll. 120–123.
	b.	—— i. 715–719	Par. viii. 9.
	c.	—— ii. 3	Inf. i. 6.
	c.	——	Inf. xxxiii. 4.
*	*b.*	—— ii. 10–13	Inf. v. 124–126.
	c.	—— ii. 12	Inf. i. 25.
	b.	—— ii. 77 *seqq.* 149–161	Inf. xxx. 98, 113 *seqq.*
	a.	—— ii. 114	Inf. xx. 112, 113.
*	*c.*	—— ii. 137, 138	Inf. xxvi. 94, 95.
	b.	—— ii. 163–170	Inf. xxvi. 63.
	b.	—— ii. 183–198	Inf. xxvi. 58–60.
*	*c.*	—— ii. 255 (?)	Inf. i. 60.
*	*a.*	—— ii. 281, 282	Conv. III. xi. ll. 158 *seqq.*
	a.	—— ii. 353	Epist. vi. 5. l. 130.
	b.	—— ii. 373, 374	Epist. vii. 3. l. 47.
*	*c.*	—— ii. 426, 427	Par. xx. 68, 121.
	b.	—— ii. 536, 537	Epist. i. 2. ll. 42–44.
*	*c.*	—— ii. 559	Inf. iii. 31.
	a.	—— iii. 1	Mon. II. iii. l. 65.
*	*b.*	—— iii. 2, 3	Inf. i. 75 [1].
*	*b.*	——	Purg. xii. 61–63.
*	*b.*	—— iii. 26 *seqq.*	Inf. xiii. 31 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	—— iii. 56, 57	Purg. xxii. 40, 41.
	a.	—— iii. 94	V. N. xxv. l. 84.
	c.	—— iii. 104, 105; 111, 112 [2] . . .	Inf. xiv. 94–102.
	a.	—— iii. 163–167	Mon. II. iii. ll. 80 *seqq.*
	b.	—— iii. 209–218	Inf. xiii. 13–15.
*	*b.*	—— iii. 245–257	Inf. xiii. 10–12.
*	*c.*	—— iii. 310–312	Inf. x. 58–60, 68.
*	*a.*	—— iii. 339, 340	Mon. II. iii. ll. 100, 101.
	b.	—— iii. 441–452	Par. xxxiii. 65, 66.
*	*b.*	—— iii. 522	Inf. i. 106.
	b.	—— iii. 707–711	Par. xix. 131, 132.
	c.	—— iv. 4	Inf. xv. 82.
*	*b.*	—— iv. 23	Purg. xxx. 48.
	b.	—— iv. 68, 101 (comp. also iv. 2) . .	Par. ix. 97.
	a.	—— iv. 171, 172	Mon. II. iii. ll. 106, 107.
*	*a.*	—— iv. 175	Conv. I. iii. l. 75.
*	*c.*	—— (?)	Inf. II. 60.
	a.	—— iv. 227–230	Mon. II. vii. ll. 82 *seqq.*
	a.	—— iv. 272–276	Epist. vii. 4. ll. 88 *seqq.*
	a.	—— iv. 272–282 [3]	Conv. IV. xxvi. l. 70.
	c.	—— iv. 317	Inf. xxvi. 80, 81.
	c.	—— iv. 522–532 (*or* viii. 26; ix. 224) [4]	Inf. ii. 1–4.

[1] Comp. also Inf. xxx. 14. [2] Note especially *mezzo mar, Ida, Rea* (=Cybele, and *fida*, as compared with Virgil *l. c.* [3] This seems to be the passage chiefly referred to. [4] Different features in all these descriptions appear (with much greater brevity, as usual) in Dante *l. c.*

	b.	Aeneid iv. 552[1]	. . . . .	Inf. v. 62.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Par. ix. 98.
	c.	——	iv. 584, 585 (*or* ix. 459, 460) . .	Purg. ix. 1, 2[2].
	a.	——	v. 70, 305	Conv. IV. xxvi. l. 136.
*	*b.*	——	v. 213–217[3]	Inf. v. 82–84.
	c.	——	v. 254–257	Purg. ix. 20–24.
	a.	——	v. 337, 338	Mon. II. viii. l. 92.
	b.	——	v. 371	Par. vi. 68.
	a.	——	v. 548 *seqq.*	Conv. IV. xxvi. l. 97.
	b.	——	v. 711–718	Purg. xviii. 136–138.
	b.	——	. . . . .	Conv. IV. xxvi. l. 94.
	c.	——	vi. 24–26	Inf. xii. 12, 13.
	c.	——	. . . . .	Purg. xxvi. 41.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 57[4]	Inf. v. 66.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 95, 96	Inf. xv. 55.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 103–105	Inf. xv. 93, 94.
*	*c.*	——	. . . . .	Par. xvii. 22–27.
	b.	——	vi. 129	V. El. II. iv. l. 70.
	a.	——	vi. 129–131	V. El. II. iv. l. 73.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 143, 144	Purg. i. 134–136.
	a.	——	vi. 170	Mon. II. iii. l. 52.
	a.	——	vi. 175–184	Conv. IV. xxvi. ll. 92 *seqq.* ll. 111 *seqq.*
	c.	——	vi. 179	Purg. xxviii. 23.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 200	Purg. xxiv. 101.
	c.	——	vi. 261–263	Inf. iii. 14, 15; 20, 21.
	a.	——	vi. 261 *seqq.*	Conv. IV. xxvi. ll. 71 *seqq.*
	b.	——	vi. 276	Epist. vi. 5. l. 128.
	c.	——	vi. 280, 281[5]	Inf. ix. 37–42.
	b.	——	vi. 297–304	Inf. iii. 82, 83.
	b.	——	vi. 300	Inf. iii. 99, 109.
*	*b.*	——	vi. 309 *seqq.*	Inf. iii. 112 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	vi. 313–330 (esp. l. 315) . . .	Purg. ii. 94–102.
	c.	——	vi. 320[6]	Inf. iii. 98.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 323	Inf. xiv. 119.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 323, 369	Inf. vii. 106.
	c.	——	vi. 327, 8	Purg. iii. 138.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 329	Inf. xv. 38.
	c.	——	vi. 362	Purg. iii. 130.

[1] See also Ovid, Heroid. Ep. vii, since the other instances in this context all occur in Ovid, Heroid. [2] The fact that Virgil is probably here imitated is not incompatible with the adaptation by Dante of the passage from the Solar to the Lunar Aurora, by the ingenious introduction of the word *concubina*. See further the discussion of this difficult passage in *Time Reff. in the Div. Com.* pp. 77–98. [3] Comp. Aen. vi. 190–192; 202, 203. [4] Probably as amplified in the note of Servius. [5] Add perhaps Georg. iv. 482, since this occurs in the episode of Orpheus, which was familiar to Dante: see note on Purg. xxx. 49–51. [6] 'Livida vada' refers to the same object as Dante's 'livida palude.'

	c.	Aeneid vi. 368, 369	Inf. xxi. 79–82.
	a.	—— vi. 376	Purg. vi. 28–30.
	b.	—— vi. 389	Inf. xii. 63[1].
	b.	—— vi. 391	Inf. iii. 88, 89.
	c.	—— vi. 395, 396	Inf. ix. 98, 99.
	c.	—— vi. 397	Inf. x. 80.
	c.	—— vi. 412–414	Inf. viii. 25–30.
	b.	—— vi. 417 *seqq.*	Inf. vi. 14, 22 *seqq.*
	b.	—— vi. 432, 433	Inf. v. 4, 5.
*	*b.*	—— vi. 442–444, 450	Inf. v. 61, 62; 67–69.
*	*b.*	—— vi. 443	Inf. x. 1.
	c.	—— vi. 452–455 (comp. l. 270) . .	Inf. xv. 17–19.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 492, 493	Inf. i. 63.
	c.	—— vi. 495–497	Inf. xxviii. 64–66.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 497	Inf. xiii. 140.
	c.	—— vi. 531–534	Inf. xv. 46, 47.
	c.	—— vi. 534	Inf. viii. 120.
	c.	—— vi. 554, 630, 631	Inf. viii. 78.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 557–561	Inf. iii. 22, 31–33.
	c.	—— vi. 563	Inf. iii. 127.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 566–569	Inf. v. 7–10.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 580, 581	Inf. xxxi. 31, 32; 42–45.
	c.	—— vi. 610, 611	Inf. vii. 25[2].
	b.	—— vi. 630, 631	Inf. viii. 70–72.
	c.	—— vi. 635, 636	Purg. I. 94–96; 124 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	—— vi. 656, 657	Purg. vii. 82, 83.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 673–678	Purg. vii. 40–42.
	a.	—— vi. 684–691	Par. xv. 25–27[3].
*	*b.*	—— vi. 700	Purg. ii. 80.
	c.	—— vi. 730–732	Inf. xxiv. 53, 54.
	c.	—— vi. 734	Inf. x. 58, 59.
	c.	——	Purg. xxii. 103.
	c.	—— vi. 754, 755	Purg. vii. 88–90.
	b.	—— vi. 763	Inf. ii. 13.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 818	Conv. IV. v. l. 91.
	a.	—— vi. 821, 822	Mon. II. v. ll. 119, 120.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 825	Conv. IV. v. ll. 122, 123.
	a.	—— vi. 826	Mon. II. v. l. 111.
*	*c.*	—— vi. 836	Par. xv. 28.
	c.	—— vi. 842	Conv. IV. v. l. 140.
*	*a.*	—— vi. 844, 845[4]	Mon. II. v. l. 98.
*	*a.*	——	Purg. xx. 25–27.
	a.	—— vi. 848–854	Mon. II. vii. ll. 71 *seqq.*
	c.	—— vi. 883	Inf. ii. 96.
	a.	—— vi. 884	Purg. xxx. 21.
	b.	—— vii. 1–4	Inf. xxvi. 92, 93.
	c.	—— vii. 9	Purg. i. 117.

[1] Comp. Purg. ix. 85. [2] Comp. Purg. xx. 11. [3] Comp. ll. 88, 89.
[4] Possibly as amplified in note of Servius.

	c.	Aeneid vii. 19, 20	Purg. xiv. 40–42.
	b.	—— vii. 72	Inf. iv. 125, 126.
	c.	—— vii. 420	Inf. i. 62.
	b.	—— vii. 641 (also x. 163)	Purg. xxix. 40.
	c.	—— viii. 26, 27[1]	Inf. ii. 1–4.
	a.	—— viii. 134–137	Mon. II. iii. ll. 73 *seqq.*
	c.	——	Inf. iv. 121.
	b.	—— viii. 192–197 (add l. 231) . . .	Inf. xxv. 26, 27.
*	*c.*	—— viii. 194	Inf. xxv. 17, 25.
*	*b.*	—— viii. 251–255	Inf. xxv. 24.
*	*c.*	—— viii. 349, 350	Purg. xxi. 41, 42.
	a.	—— viii. 652–656	Mon. II. iv. ll. 53 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	—— viii. 670	Purg. I. 31 *seqq.*[2]
	c.	—— viii. 686	Par. vi. 79.
	c.	—— viii. 714 *seqq.*	Purg. xxix. 116.
	b.	—— ix. 224, 225[3]	Inf. ii. 1–4.
	b.	—— ix. 431–445	Inf. i. 108.
*	*b.*	—— x. 58 (*or* iv. 344; vii. 322) . .	Epist. vi. 4. l. 104.
*	*b.*	—— x. 198–200	Inf. xx. 55 *seqq.*
	c.	—— x. 264–266	Inf. v. 46, 47.
	b.	—— x. 479 *seqq.* & xii. 948 . . .	Par. vi. 36.
*	*c.*	—— x. 761	Inf. ix. 48.
	c.	—— x. 843	Epist. vi. 4. l. 115.
	c.	—— xi. 150, 151	Purg. xxxi. 20, 21.
	c.	—— xi. 182 (comp. Georg. iii. 66) .	Par. xxviii. 2.
	c.	—— xi. 657, 662	Inf. iv. 124.
	b.	—— xi. 801–831	Inf. i. 107.
	b.	—— xii. 595–603	Epist. vii. 7. ll. 148 *seqq.*
	b.	—— xii. 604 *seqq.*	Purg. xvii. 34–39.
	a.	—— xii. 936, 937	Mon. II. iii. ll. 114, 115.
	a.	—— xii. 940 *seqq.*	Mon. II. xi. ll. 15 *seqq.*
	b.	—— xii. 947–952	Inf. i. 108.
	a.	——	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 95[4].

Horace.

*	*c.*	Carm. III. iii. 49 . (?)	Conv. I. ix. ll. 45–48[5].
	b.	Epist. I. xiv. 43	V. El. II. i. ll. 80, 81.
*	*c.*	—— II. i. 58, 59	Purg. xxii. 97, 98.
	a.	Ars Poet. l. 38	V. El. II. iv. l. 35.
*	*c.*	—— l. 54	Purg. xxii. 97, 98.
*	*b.*	—— ll. 60, 61; 70, 71	Par. xxvi. 137, 138.
	a.	—— ll. 70, 71	Conv. II. xiv. ll. 87–89.

[1] See note *sup.* on Aeneid iv. 522–532. [2] Cato as guardian of Purgatory. [3] See note *sup.* on Aeneid iv. 522–532. [4] This reference does not belong to any definite passage of Virgil, but to Dante's general allegorical treatment of the poem. See especially Conv. IV. xxvi. ll. 60, 70. [5] Comp. Conv. IV. xii. l. 83.

	a.	Ars Poet.	ll. 75–78	Epist. x. 10 *fin.* l. 228.
	a.	——	ll. 93–95	Epist. x. 10, ll. 212 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	l. 141	V. N. xxv. l. 93.
	c.	——	l. 142 (?)	Inf. xxvi. 97–99.
*	*c.*	——	ll. 296–301	Conv. III. xiv. l. 74.
*	*c.*	——	l. 359	V. N. xxv. l. 91.
	c.	——	ll. 394, 395	Inf. xxxii. 10, 11.

OVID.

*	*c.*	Metam.	i. 63, 64	Par. xii. 46, 47.
*	*a.*	——	i. 78–83	Conv. IV. xv. ll. 76 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	i. 89 *seqq.*, 101–112	Purg. xxii. 148–150.
*	*c.*	——	. . . . .	Purg. xxvii. 134,5; xxviii. 69.
*	*c.*	——	. . . . .	Purg. xxviii. 139–144.
	c.	——	i. 270	Par. xxviii. 32.
	b.	——	i. 379–387	Purg. xxxiii. 46–48.
*	*c.*	——	i. 625–627; 713, 714	Purg. xxix. 95, 96.
	b.	——	i. 682–721	Purg. xxxii. 64–66.
	b.	——	i. 755 *seqq.*	Par. xvii. 1–3.
	a.	——	ii. 35 *seqq.*	Conv. II. xv. l. 54.
	b.	——	ii. 107 *seqq.*, 227–232, 272 *seqq.* .	Purg. xxix. 118, 119.
*	*c.*	——	ii. 112, 113 (?)	Purg. xxx. 22, 23.
*	*c.*	——	ii. 142, 143	Purg. iv. 138, 139.
	a.	——	ii. 153, 154	Conv. IV. xxiii. ll. 135 *seqq.*
	b.	——	ii. 200	Inf. xvii. 106[1].
*	*b.*	——	ii. 453–455; 464, 465	Purg. xxv. 130.
	c.	——	ii. 500 *seqq.* (esp. ll. 506, 7)[2] .	Par. xxxi. 32, 33.
*	*b.*	——	ii. 708 *seqq.*	Purg. xiv. 139.
	c.	——	ii. 868 *seqq.*	Par. xxvii. 84.
*	*c.*	——	iii. 183, 184	Par. xxvii. 28, 29.
	c.	——	iii. 308, 309	Par. xxi. 6.
	b.	——	iii. 324–331	Inf. xx. 40–45.
	b.	——	iii. 395–399	Par. xii. 14, 15.
	b.	——	iii. 407 *seqq.*	Inf. xxx. 128.
	b.	——	iii. 417	Par. iii. 18.
	a.	——	iv. 1 *seqq.*, 389, 425 *seqq.* . . .	Epist. iv. 4. l. 40.
	a.	——	iv. 58	Mon. II. ix. ll. 30–32.
	a.	——	iv. 88	Mon. II. ix. l. 34.
	b.	——	iv. 145, 146; 158–166. . . .	Purg. xxvii. 37–39.
	b.	——	iv. 158–166	Purg. xxxiii. 69.
	c.	——	iv. 192, 241	Par. xxii. 142.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Epist. iv. 4. l. 49.
*	*b.*	——	iv. 373–379	Inf. xxv. 69–78.
*	*b.*	——	iv. 511–529	Inf. xxx. 4–12.
	a.	——	iv. 570–588	Inf. xxv. 97, 98.
	b.	——	iv. 585–588	Inf. xxv. 133–137.
	b.	——	v. 250–255	Epist. x. 1. l. 11.

[1] Comp. Purg. iv. 72.

[2] Comp. Fast. iii. 107, 108.

	a.	Metam.	v. 294-299; 677, 678	V. El. I. ii. l. 53.
	b.	——	v. 298 *seqq.*	Purg. i. 11.
*	*b.*	——	v. 338, 339	Purg. i. 9.
*	*b.*	——	v. 346-353	Par. viii. 67-70.
	a.	——	v. 365	Conv. II. vi. ll. 123-125.
*	*b.*	——	v. 397-399	Purg. xxviii. 50, 51.
	c.	——	v. 455-458	Inf. xxv. 112-114.
	a.	——	v. 572 *seqq.*	Inf. xxv. 97, 98.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 47-49	Purg. ii. 7-9.
	c.	——	vi. 70-82	Purg. xv. 98.
*	*b.*	——	vi. 140-151	Purg. xii. 43-45.
*	*b.*	——	vi. 182, 183; 192; 301, 302. .	Purg. xii. 37-39.
	b.	——	vi. 185-192	Purg. xx. 130-132.
	b.	——	vi. 383-391	Par. i. 20.
*	*b.*	——	vi. 609, 610; 623 *seqq.* . . .	Purg. xvii. 19, 20.
*	*b.*	——	vii. 118-120	Par. ii. 18.
	a.	——	vii. 474-477	Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 192, 193.
	a.	——	vii. 490 *seqq.*	Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 157 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	vii. 507-511	Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 173 *seqq.*
	a.	——	vii. 520-662	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 184 [1].
	b.	——	vii. 528 *seqq.*	Inf. xxix. 58-66 [2].
	a.	——	vii. 614 *seqq.*	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 164.
	a.	——	vii. 652, 653	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 169.
*	*b.*	——	vii. 759 *seqq.*	Purg. xxxiii. 49-51.
	b.	——	viii. 174-182	Par. xiii. 13-15.
	b.	——	viii. 225-232	Inf. xvii. 109-111.
	b.	——	viii. 511-524	Purg. xxv. 22-24.
*	*b.*	——	viii. 777 *seqq.* [3]	Purg. xxiii. 22-27.
*	*c.*	——	viii. 825-827	Purg. xxiv. 28.
*	*b.*	——	ix. 101-108; 131-133. . . .	Inf. xii. 66-69.
	a.	——	ix. 183	Mon. II. viii. l. 82.
	a.	——	. . . . .	Conv. III. iii. l. 51.
*	*b.*	——	ix. 407, 408	Par. iv. 105.
*	*b.*	——	x. 150, 151	Purg. xii. 33.
	b.	——	x. 298 *seqq.*	Inf. xxx. 37 *seqq.*
	b.	——	. . . . .	Epist. vii. 7. ll. 146, 147.
*	*b.*	——	x. 525, 526	Purg. xxviii. 65, 66.
	a.	——	x. 560 *seqq.*	Mon. II. viii. l. 84.
	b.	——	xi. 1 *seqq.*	Conv. II. i. l. 25.
	b.	——	xi. 100-145	Purg. xx. 106-108.
	b.	——	xii. 210 *seqq.*	Purg. xxiv. 121-123.
*	*c.*	——	xiii. 171, 172 (*or* Rem. Amor. ll. 47, 48)	Inf. xxxi. 4-6.
	b.	——	xiii. 404-406 (add ll. 448 *seqq.*,	
	b.	——	536, 567-569)	Inf. xxx. 15-21.
*	*c.*	——	xiii. 406	Inf. i. 48.

[1] Compare 'Dice e ritrae per *lungo sermone*,' &c., with ll. 661, 2—Talibus atque aliis longum sermonibus illi Implevere diem. [2] Comp. esp. l. 66 with ll. 547, 585, 6 in Ovid. [3] Note esp. ll. 801-4; 875-8.

*	*b.*	Metam.	xiii. 429–438 [1]	Purg. xx. 115.
	b.	——	xiii. 940–949	Par. i. 68, 69.
*	*b.*	——	xiv. 308	Inf. xxvi. 91, 92.
	c.	——	xiv. 694 (?) (cf. Trist. V. viii. ll. 7–9)	Epist. iv. 5. l. 51.
	c.	——	xiv. 845 (cf. iv. 479)	Purg. xxi. 50.
*	*b.*	——	xv. 371 (cf. Fast. iv. 163, 4) . .	Purg. ix. 6.
*	*b.*	——	xv. 393–400	Inf. xxiv. 108–110.
	b.	——	xv. 493–505	Par. xvii. 46, 47.
	c.	Heroid.	ii. 1	Par. ix. 100, 101.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 40	Inf. xviii. 91.
	c.	——	xiii. 101 (?)	Purg. xii. 5, 6.
	c.	——	xviii. 173, 174	Purg. xxviii. 73, 74.
*	*c.*	——	xix. 195, 196	Inf. xxvi. 7.
*	*c.*	Ars Amat.	i. 652–656	Inf. xxvii. 7–12.
	a.	Rem. Amor.	l. 2	V. N. xxv. ll. 95–97.
*	*c.*	——	ll. 47, 48 (*or* Met. xiii. 171, 2)	Inf. xxxi. 4–6.

LUCAN.

	c.	Pharsalia	i. 41	Par. vi. 75.
	a.	——	i. 44	V. N. xxv. l. 87.
	a.	——	i. 109–111	Mon. II. ix. l. 87 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	i. 269, 271	Inf. xxviii. 101, 102.
*	*a.*	——	i. 280–282	Epist. vii. 4. ll. 81 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	. . . . .	Inf. xxviii. 97–99.
*	*c.*	——	i. 313	Purg. vi. 125.
*	*b.*	——	i. 399–404; 424, 5; 433, 4; 464	Par. vi. 58–60.
*	*b.*	——	i. 586	Inf. xx. 46, 47.
*	*a.*	——	ii. 135–138	Mon. II. xi. ll. 44 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	ii. 338–345	Conv. IV. xxviii. ll. 97–119.
*	*b.*	——	. . . . .	Purg. i. 79 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	ii. 341	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 142.
*	*a.*	——	ii. 383	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 32.
*	*c.*	——	ii. 396–398	Purg. xiv. 31.
*	*a.*	——	ii. 396–438	V. El. I. x. l. 46.
*	*c.*	——	ii. 437, 438 [2]	Purg. xiv. 31–33.
*	*a.*	——	ii. 672 *seqq.*	Mon. II. ix. l. 55 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	. . . . .	Purg. xxviii. 71, 72.
*	*a.*	——	iii. 119–121	Conv. IV. xi. ll. 27 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	iii. 153–155; 167, 168 . . .	Purg. ix. 136–138.
*	*c.*	——	iii. 248 & ix. 539	Purg. iv. 56, 7; 120; & v. 5.
*	*b.*	——	iii. 453–455 (add B. iv. *init.*) .	Purg. xviii. 101, 102.
*	*b.*	——	iii. 572, 573, 577	Par. ix. 93.
*	*b.*	——	iv. 587–602 [3]	Inf. xxxi. 115–118.

[1] See also Virg. Aen. iii. 49 *seqq.* [2] Comp. Virg. Aen. III. 414 *seqq.*
[3] Comp. esp. ll. 588 ('Bagrada') and 602 in Lucan with ll. 115 and 118 in Dante, and see under Lucan, No. 10.

*	*c.*	Pharsalia	iv. 595, 596	Inf. xxxi. 124.
*	*b.*	——	iv. 596, 597	Inf. xxxi. 119–121.
*	*a.*	——	iv. 609 *seqq.*	Mon. II. viii. l. 80.
*	*c.*	——	iv. 633	Inf. xxxi. 132.
	a.	——	iv. 642 *seqq.*	Conv. III. iii. l. 53.
*	*c.*	——	v. 72, 73	Par. i. 16–18.
*	*a.*	——	v. 527–531	Conv. IV. xiii. ll. 110–121.
*	*b.*	——	. . . . .	Par. xi. 67–69.
*	*b.*	——	v. 711–716	Par. xviii. 73–78.
*	*b.*	——	vi. 507 *seqq.*	Inf. ix. 22–27.
*	*c.*	——	vii. 832–834	Purg. xxvi. 43–45.
*	*a.*	——	viii. 692–694	Mon. II. ix. ll. 67 *seqq.*
	b.	——	ix. 371–378	Inf. xiv. 14, 15.
*	*a.*	——	ix. 438–445; 531, 532 . . .	Conv. III. v. ll. 116 *seqq.*
	a.	——	ix. 477–480.	Mon. II. iv. ll. 34 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	ix. 554, 555	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 122.
*	*c.*	——	ix. 561	Conv. IV. v. l. 140.
*	*c.*	——	ix. 561	Purg. i. 80.
	a.	——	ix. 580	Epist. x. 22. l. 425.
*	*b.*	——	ix. 710–720.	Inf. xxiv. 85–87[1].
	a.	——	ix. 763–804.	Inf. xxv. 94, 95.
	b.	——	ix. 961 *seqq.* 976, 977 . . .	Par. vi. 67, 68.

Statius.

*	*c.*	Thebais	i. 41	Purg. xxii. 58.
*	*a.*	——	i. 47	Conv. III. viii. l. 94.
*	*c.*	——	i. 103, 113, 115	Inf. ix. 38–42.
*	*a.*	——	i. 397 *seqq.* & 482–497 . . .	Conv. IV. xxv. l. 63.
*	*a.*	——	i. 537–539	Conv. IV. xxv. ll. 84 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	i. 671–681	Conv. IV. xxv. ll. 109–116.
*	*c.*	——	ii. 1–6	Inf. ix. 82 *seqq.*
	b.	——	ii. 265 *seqq.*[2]	Purg. xii. 50, 51.
*	*b.*	——	ii. 595–599	Purg. xii. 28–33.
	b.	——	ii. 596	Inf. xxxi. 98[3].
*	*c.*	——	ii. 599	Inf. xiv. 52, 55.
	b.	——	iv. 716 *seqq.*	Purg. xxii. 112.
	a.	——	v. 609, 610	Conv. III. xi. l. 165 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	v. 720–722	Purg. xxvi. 94–96.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 799–801	Par. xxv. 133–135.
*	*c.*	——	vi. 854–857	Par. xxvi. 85–87.
*	*b.*	——	vii. 794 *seqq.* (& esp. viii. 27, 84)	Inf. xx. 32–36.
*	*b.*	——	viii. 739 *seqq.*[4]	Inf. xxxii. 130–132.
	c.	——	ix. 434 *seqq.*[5].	Purg. xviii. 91–93.

[1] With *pestilenze* in l. 88 comp. Lucan *l. c.* ll. 724, 734, 805 *seqq.* [2] Comp. esp. 'infaustos ornatus' with 'sventurato adornamento.' [3] 'Ismisurato' = 'immensus.' [4] Comp. also l. 757 with Inf. xxxiii. 76. [5] Ismenus *loquitur.*

*	*c.*	Thebais x. 630	Purg. xxii. 58.
*	*c.*	—— x. 883 *seqq.* (esp. ll. 889, 904, 909, 927)	Inf. xiv. 51–60.
*	*b.*	—— xii. 429–432	Inf. xxvi. 52–54.
*	*c.*	—— xii. 816, 817	Purg. xxi. 94–99.
*	*c.*	Achilleis i. 9–11	Par. i. 13–18.
*	*c.*	—— i. 15, 16	Par. i. 29.
*	*b.*	—— i. 247–250	Purg. ix. 34 *seqq.*
	b.	—— i. 537 *seqq.* and ii. *init.* . . .	Inf. xxvi. 61, 62.
	c.	—— ii. 452	Purg. xxi. 93[1].

JUVENAL.

*	*c.*	Satires vii. 82–87	Conv. IV. xxv. l. 60.
*	*c.*	——	Purg. xxi. 88–90.
	a.	—— viii. 6–32	Conv. IV. xxix. ll. 37 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	—— viii. 20	Mon. II. iii. l. 18.
*	*a.*	—— x. 22[2]	Conv. IV. xiii. l. 108.
*	*c.*	—— x. 362	Par. xv. 107.

CICERO.

	a.	De Officiis I. xi. 34	Mon. II. x. l. 22.
*	*a.*	—— xii. 38	Mon. II. x. ll. 37 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	—— xii. 38	Mon. II. x. l. 62 *seqq.*
	c.	—— xiii. 39	Conv. IV. v. ll. 124 *seqq.*[3]
	b.	—— xiii. 41	Inf. xi. 22–27.
*	*b.*	——	Inf. xxvii. 75.
*	*a.*	—— xiv. 42	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 111.
*	*a.*	—— 43	Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 135 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	—— xvi. 51	Conv. IV. i. l. 17.
*	*b.*	—— xvii. 56	Conv. IV. i. l. 6.
*	*a.*	—— xxvi. 91 (*fin.*)	Conv. IV. xv. l. 123.
	a.	—— xxviii. 95 (*fin.*) & xxix. 99	Conv. IV. viii. ll. 9 *seqq.*
	a.	—— xxxi. 112	Mon. II. v. ll. 158 *seqq.*
	a.	—— xxxiv. 122, 123	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 100.
*	*a.*	—— xxxv. 127	Conv. IV. xxv. l. 95.
*	*c.*	—— II. vii. 25	Inf. xii. 107.
	a.	—— viii. 26, 27	Mon. II. v. l. 55.
	c.	—— xiv. 48	Conv. II. vii. ll. 53 *seqq.*
	c.	—— III. viii. 35[4]	Conv. IV. vi. ll. 84 *seqq.*
	a.	—— x. 42	Mon. II. viii. l. 95.
*	*c.*	—— xxv. 95	Par. v. 70.
	a.	De Finibus I. i. 1, 2	Conv. I. xi. l. 95.

[1] This is not exactly a quotation, but it is a direct reference to the abrupt termination of the unfinished Achilleid at the place indicated. [2] Probably however not from Juvenal, but from Boethius (see *sup.* p. 257). [3] Comp. 'mandato a Roma per commutare li presi Cartaginesi' with 'de captivis commutandis Romam missus.' [4] Comp. Acad. II. xxii. 71.

	a.	De Finibus I. ix. 29, 30[1]	Conv. IV. vi. l. 110.
	a.	—— II. iv. 12	Mon. II. v. l. 84.
	a.	—— xix. 61	Mon. II. v. l. 141.
	a.	—— III. vi. 22 (*fin.*)	Conv. IV. xxii. l. 16.
*	*b.*	—— vii. 23 *or* V. vi. 17 . . .	Conv. IV. xxi. l. 121 & xxii. l. 35.
*	*c.*	—— V. xviii. 49	Purg. xix. 19–24.
	b.	—— xxii. 63	Purg. xiii. 32.
	a.	De Amicitia v. 19 (*med.*) & vi. 20 (*fin.*)	Conv. I. xii. ll. 19 *seqq.*
	b.	—— vii. 24	Purg. xiii. 32.
	a.	—— ix. 29[2]	Conv. I. xii. l. 24.
	c.	—— xx. 74	Conv. III. i. ll. 39 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	—— xxvi. 98	Inf. xviii. 133–5.
	a.	De Senectute ii. 4, 5	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 93.
	a.	—— v. 13.	Conv. IV. xxiv. l. 62.
	c.	—— vi. 19 (*fin.*)	Conv. IV. xxvii. ll. 95, 96.
*	*a.*	—— x. 33 (*fin.*)	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 18.
	a.	—— xiv. 46 (*init.*)	Conv. IV. xxvii. l. 151.
*	*c.*	—— xv. 52, 53	Conv. IV. xxiv. ll. 107–111.
	c.	—— xvi. 55, 56	Conv. IV. v. ll. 110–115.
	c.	—— xix. 71 (*med.*)	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 28[3].
	a.	—— xix. 71 (*fin.*)	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 14.
	a.	—— xxi. 77 (*med.*)	Conv. IV. xxi. ll. 80 *seqq.*
	a.	—— xxi. 77, 78	Conv. II. ix. l. 67.
*	*c.*	—— xxii. 80	Purg. ix. 17.
*	*a.*	—— xxiii. 83	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 44.
	c.	—— xxiii. 84 (*med.*)	Conv. IV. xxviii. l. 51.
*	*c.*	Orator iii. 9, 10[4]	Conv. II. v. ll. 21 *seqq.*
	a.	De Inventione I. xv. 20[5]	Epist. x. 19. l. 320.
	a.	—— xxxviii. 68	Mon. II. v. l. 16.
*	*b.*	Academica I. iv. 16, 17	Conv. IV. vi. ll. 125 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	In Catilinam III. vii. 16 (?)	Inf. xxxiv. 67.
	c.	Somn. Scip. xvi (*fin.*) xix. (*init.*)[6] . .	Par. xxii. 134–138, 151.
*	*c.*	—— xvii	Inf. ii. 76–78.
*	*a.*	Paradoxa i. 6	Conv. IV. xii. ll. 55 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	. . . . ?	Conv. IV. xxix. l. 73.

Livy.

	a.	Livius Hist. Lib. I. i.	Mon. II. iii. ll. 32–35.
*	*c.*	—— iv. (*init.*)	Par. viii. 131, 132.
*	*a.*	—— xviii.	Conv. III. xi. l. 31.
	a.	—— xx.	Mon. II. iv. l. 33.
	a.	—— xxiv, xxv. . . .	Mon. II. xi. l. 37.

[1] Also I. v. 13, where Torquatus is mentioned as an Epicurean. [2] From 'Quanquam confirmatur,' &c. [3] The same § having been directly quoted a few lines above. [4] See under Plato, No. 6. [5] Quoted by Dante as *Nova Rhetorica*. [6] The context also being similar.

	c.	Livius Hist.	Lib. I. xxiv, xxv . . .	Par. vi. 39.
	a.	——	II. v.	Mon. II. v. l. 114.
	a.	——	xii.	Mon. II. v. l. 126.
	c.	——	. . . . .	Par. iv. 84.
	c.	——	xiii.[1]	Mon. II. iv. ll. 65 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	III. xxvi–xxix.[2] . . .	Mon. II. v. ll. 76 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	V. xxxii. & xliii. . .	Mon. II. v. ll. 102 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	xlvii.	Mon. II. iv. l. 48.
*	*c.*	——	. . . .	Conv. IV. v. ll. 161 *seqq.*
	a.	——	VIII. ix. & X. xxviii. .	Mon. II. v. l. 130.
*	*a.*	——	XXIII. xii.	Inf. xxviii. 11, 12.
*	*c.*	——	. . . . .	Conv. IV. v. l. 167.
	a.	——	XXVI. xi.	Mon. II. iv. l. 63.
*	*a.*	——	(?)	Mon. II. ix. l. 66[3].

Orosius.

	a.	Adversus Paganos	I. ii. 7, 13	Quaest. xix. l. 43.
	a.	——	ii. 11	Mon. II. iii. l. 87.
*	*a.*	——	iv. 1, 4	Mon. II. ix. l. 25.
*	*b.*	——	iv. 4–8	Inf. v. 52–59.
	a.	——	xiv. 1–3	Mon. II. ix. ll. 35 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	xx. 1–4 (?) . . .	Inf. xxvii. 7–12.
	a.	——	II. iv. 9	Mon. II. xi. l. 37.
	b.	——	vii. 6	Purg. xii. 55–57.
*	*a.*	——	xii. 8[4].	Mon. II. v. ll. 76 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	IV. xvi. 5	Conv. IV. v. l. 167[5].
*	*c.*	——	VI. i. 5[6]	Par. viii. 131, 132.
*	*b.*	——	xv. 1 to xvi. 5, 6 .	Par. vi. 58–72.
	c.	——	xix. 18[7]	Par. vi. 76–78.
	c.	——	xxii. 1–5[8] . . .	Par. vi. 81.
*	*b.*	——	xxii. 5 *seqq.*[9] . .	Mon. I. xvi. ll. 3 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	. .	Conv. IV. v. ll. 51 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	. .	Epist. vii. 3, ll. 64 *seqq.*
*	*a.*	——	VII. iii. 1	Conv. III. xi. l. 26.
*	*b.*	——	iii. 8, & ix. 8 *fin.* .	Purg. xxi. 82–84.
*	*b.*	——		Par. vi. 92, 93.

Boethius.

*	*c.*	De Cons. Phil.	I. Pros. ii.	Purg. xxx. 73 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	Pros. iii. (*sub init.*) .	Inf. ii. 76[10].

[1] Perhaps Oros. II. v. 3. [2] Or perhaps Oros. II. xii. 8. [3] A statement wrongly attributed to Livy. [4] Or perhaps Liv. III. xxvi–xxix. [5] See under Livy xxiii. 12. [6] See note on Livy I. iv. [7] Comp. Virg. Aen. viii. 696, 697. [8] Add I. i. 6 *seqq.* & VI. xx. 1, 8 &c. [9] Other places both in Dante and Orosius might be added. See passages discussed under 'Orosius.' [10] The supposed reference to Ruth iii. 11 (as by Scartazzini and Tommaseo) seems quite out of place.

*	*a.*	De Cons. Phil. I.	Pros. iv.[1]	Conv. III. ii. l. 144.
*	*c.*	——	Pros. iv.[2]	Conv. I. iii. l. 32.
*	*c.*	——	. . . .	Par. xvii. 52.
	a.	——	Pros. iv. (*ad fin.*) . .	Conv. I. ii. ll. 95 *seqq.*
	c.	——	Pros. vi. (*fin.*) . . .	Purg. xv. 64–66.
	a.	——	II. Pros. i.[3]	Conv. II. xi. l. 18.
	a.	——	Pros. i.[4]	Conv. III. i. l. 78.
*	*c.*	——	Pros. i. (*sub med.* & *fin.*)	Inf. vii. 88–90.
*	*c.*	——	Metr. i. ll. 5–7 . . .	Inf. vii. 94–96.
*	*b.*	——	Pros. ii (*init.*) . . .	Inf. vii. 91–93.
*	*a.*	——	Metr. ii. ll. 1–8 . .	Conv. IV. xii. l. 74.
*	*c.*	——	. . .	Inf. vii. 64–66.
*	*b.*	——	Pros. iv. (*sub init.*) .	Inf. v. 121–123.
	a.	——	Pros. v. l. 9	Conv. IV. xiii. l. 131.
	a.	——	Pros. v. ll. 11, 12 . .	Conv. IV. xiii. l. 139.
	c.	——	Pros. v. ll. 15–17 . .	Purg. xv. 61 *seqq.*
*	*b.*	——	Pros. v. (*fin.*)[5] . .	Conv. IV. xiii. l. 108.
	a.	——	Metr. v. ll. 27–30 . .	Conv. IV. xii. l. 35.
	b.	——	Pros. vi. (*sub fin.*) .	Conv. IV. vii. ll. 87 *seqq.*
	a.	——	Metr. vi. ll. 8–13 . .	Mon. II. ix. ll. 91 *seqq.*
*	*c.*	——	Pros. vii. (*sub med.*) .	Purg. xi. 103–108.
	c.	——	Metr. vii. ll. 1–6 . .	Par. xxii. 151.
*	*c.*	——	Metr. viii. l. 15 . .	Par. i. 74.
	a.	——	Metr. viii. ll. 28–30 .	Mon. I. ix. l. 25.
	c.	——	III. Pros. i. ll. 11–13 . .	Par. xvii. 130–132.
	b.	——	Pros. iv. (*med.*) . .	Conv. IV. vii. ll. 87 *seqq.*
	a.	——	Pros. vi. ll. 15–17 . .	Conv. I. xi. l. 56.
	c.	——	Pros. vi. (*ad fin.*) . .	Conv. IV. xxix. ll. 70 *seqq.*
	c.	——	Pros. ix. (*ad fin.*)[6] .	Purg. xxx. 131, 132.
	c.	——	Metr. ix. ll. 5, 6 . .	Par. vii. 64, 65.
	a.	——	Metr. ix. ll. 6–8 . .	Conv. III. ii. l. 146.
	c.	——	Metr. ix. ll. 13, 14 (?)	Par. ii. 133–135.
	a.	——	Metr. ix. l. 27 . . .	Epist. x. 33. l. 617.
	c.	——	Pros. x.[7]	Purg. xxviii. 136.
	c.	——	. . . .	Par. viii. 138.
	a.	——	IV. Pros. iii. (*ad fin.*) . .	Conv. II. viii. l. 27.
*	*c.*	——	V. Metr. i. ll. 3, 4 . . .	Purg. xxxiii. 112.

SENECA.

	a.	De Beneficiis II. i. (*ad fin.*)		Conv. I. viii. l. 121[8].
	b.	—— IV. ix, xi, xii.		Conv. I. viii. ll. 11 *seqq.*[9]
*	*a.*	Epistolae lxxvi. (*sub init.*) ?		Conv. IV. xii. l. 120.

[1] 'Tu mihi et,' &c. [2] 'At vero hic,' &c., to 'meruisse creduntur.' [3] 'Verum omnis,' &c. [4] 'Neque enim,' &c. [5] See also under 'Juvenal.' [6] 'Haec igitur,' &c. [7] 'Super haec, inquit,' &c. [8] In the *Ed. Pad.* it is noted that many of the details in this chapter are derived from the same source. [9] Especially the second and third points here insisted on.

* *a.* Epistolae cxix. (*ad med.*) . . . . . Conv. IV. xii. l. 82.
* *a.* Naturales Quaestiones i. 1; vii. 17 . . Conv. II. xiv. l. 174.
* *c.* Controv. I. *sub init.* (p. 66, Ed. 1672) . Conv. IV. xxviii. ll. 121*seqq.*

SENECA (Pseudo) :—
a. De IV. Virtutibus c. (?) . . . . . Conv. III. viii. l. 108[1].
a. De IV. Virtutibus c. iv.[2] . . . . . Mon. II. v. l. 24.
* *a.* Fort. Remedia . . . . . Epist. iv. 5. l. 53.

S. AUGUSTINE.

* *c.* De Civitate Dei V. xviii.[3] . . . . . Conv. IV. v. l. 108.
* *c.* —— VII. xxviii.[4] . . . . Conv. II. v. ll. 21 *seqq.*
a. —— XVI. ii. (*ad fin.*) . . . Mon. III. iv. ll. 52 *seqq.*
* *c.* —— XVIII. xxv, xxxvii. (Add VIII. ii.) . . . . Conv. III. xi. ll. 35 *seqq.*
* *c.* —— XXII. v. (*fin.*) . . . Par. xxiv. 106–108.
* *a.* De doctrina Christiana I. xxxvi. (*ad fin.*) Mon. III. iv. l. 63.
a. —— xxxvii. (*med.*) Mon. III. iv. l. 70.
a. Confessiones I. vii. (*sub init.*) (?) . . Conv. I. iv. l. 67.
* *c.* —— IV. xvi. (*med.*) . . . . Purg. xxii. 67–69.
* *b.* Sermones (App.) cxx. 4 & cxciv. 2 . . Par. xxxii. 4–6.
* *c.* De Trinitate X. 17, 18 . . . . . Purg. xxv. 83.
a. ? . . . . . Conv. IV. ix. l. 83.
a. ? . . . . . Conv. IV. xxi. l. 126.

MINOR AUTHORS.

AESOPUS :—
a. Fabulae i. . . . . Conv. IV. xxx. l. 40.
* *a.* Fabulae (?) . . . . . Inf. xxiii. 4.

EUCLID :—
a. Elem. Geom. (?) . . . . . Conv. II. xiv. l. 209.

PTOLEMY :—
a. (?) . . . . . Conv. II. xiv. l. 198.
a. (?) . . . . . Conv. II. xiv. l. 251.
a. (?) . . . . . Quaest. xxi. l. 31.

LUCRETIUS :—
* *c.* De rerum natura II, 115, 116 (?) . . . Par. xiv. 112-117.

VALERIUS MAXIMUS :—
* *b.* Fact. et Dict. II. i. 5 . . . . . Purg. xxii. 145.
* *c.* —— IV. i. 6[5] (?) . . . . . Purg. xxix. 116.

[1] Author not named *here*, but the work is quoted as 'Seneca' in Mon. II. v. [2] *Auct.* Witte—the work being really that of Martinus Dumiensis. [3] See under Virgil, No. 25 a. [4] See under Plato, *sup.* p. 163. [5] This is a very doubtful reference, but I cannot find anything nearer in any other likely author.

* *c.* Fact. et Dict. V. i. Ext. 2 . . . . . Purg. xv. 94–105.
* *c.* —— IX. ii. Ext. 9. . . . . Inf. xxvii. 7–12.
* *c.* —— IX. xiii. Ext. 3 and 4[1] . Inf. xii. 107.

SUETONIUS:—
b. Julius Caesar, c. xlix. (?) . . . . . Purg. xxvi. 77, 78.

GALEN:—
* *a.* De cognoscendis morbis, c. x. . . . . Mon. I. xiii. l. 45.

VEGETIUS:—
* *a.* De Re Militari iii. 9 . . . . . Mon. II. x. l. 22.

DOUBTFUL:—
* *b.* Euripides Medea, 809[2] (?) . . . . . Par. xii. 57.

[1] See note on Cicero de Off. II. vii. 25. [2] Whence was this derived?

INDEX TO QUOTATIONS. No. II.

THE quotations are given in this Index in the order of Dante's works.

It has not been thought necessary to repeat in this Index all the footnotes. Fuller information will occasionally be found by referring to Index I.

Also the references in this Index are sometimes entered more briefly, only the first or some leading line in a passage being given.

INFERNO.

c.	Inferno i. 6	Virg. Aen. ii. 3.
c.	—— i. 7	Ecclus. xli. 1.
c.	—— i. 25	Virg. Aen. ii. 12.
b.	—— i. 32, 45, 49	Jer. v. 6.
c.	—— i. 33 (p. 180, 181)	Virg. Aen. i. 323.
c.	—— i. 39, 40	Virg. Georg. ii. 336–342
c.	—— i. 48 (p. 222)	Ovid Met. xiii. 406.
c.	—— i. 60 (p. 176)	Virg. Aen. ii. 255 (?).
c.	—— i. 61 (p. 48)	Prov. iv. 19.
c.	—— i. 62	Virg. Aen. vii. 420.
c.	—— i. 63 (p. 181)	Virg. Aen. vi. 492, 493.
c.	—— i. 73	Virg. Aen. i. 544, 545.
b.	—— i. 75	Virg. Aen. iii. 2, 3.
b.	—— i. 106 (p. 179)	Virg. Aen. iii. 522.
b.	—— i. 107	Virg. Aen. xi. 801–831.
b.	—— i. 108	Virg. Aen. ix. 431–445.
b.	—— i. 108	Virg. Aen. xii. 947–952.
c.	—— i. 111	Wisd. ii. 24.
c.	—— i. 117	Rev. xxi. 8.
c.	—— i. 128	Ps. x. 5.
b.	—— i. 129	Ps. lxiv. 5.
c.	—— ii. 1–4	Virg. Aen. ix. 224, 225 [1].
b.	—— ii. 13	Virg. Aen. vi. 763.
b.	—— ii. 28–30 (p. 71)	2 Cor. xii. 2–4.
b.	—— ii. 28	Acts ix. 15.
c.	—— ii. 45–47	Ar. Eth. IV. iii. 35 (1125 *a.* 25–7).
c.	—— ii. 60 (p. 191)	Virg. Aen. iv. 175 (?).
b.	—— ii. 76 (p. 284)	Boeth. Cons. I. Pros. iii. (*sub in.*).

[1] Add perhaps viii. 26, 27; iv. 522–532.

c.	Inferno	ii. 76–78 (p. 262)	Cic. Somn. Scip. xvii.
c.	——	ii. 80, 81	Virg. Aen. i. 76–77.
c.	——	ii. 88–90 (p. 106)	Ar. Eth. III. vi. 4 (1115 *a.* 17, 18).
c.	——	ii. 96	Virg. Aen. vi. 883.
c.	——	iii. 14, 15, 20, 21	Virg. Aen. vi. 261–263.
c.	——	iii. 22, 31 (p. 192)	Virg. Aen. vi. 557–561.
c.	——	iii. 31 (p. 192)	Virg. Aen. ii. 559.
c.	——	iii. 34–51 (p. 80)	Rev. iii. 15, 16.
c.	——	iii. 49–51, 64	Ecclus. xliv. 9.
b.	——	iii. 82, 83	Virg. Aen. vi. 297–304.
b.	——	iii. 88, 89	Virg. Aen. vi. 391.
c.	——	iii. 98	Virg. Aen. vi. 320.
b.	——	iii. 99, 109	Virg. Aen. vi. 300.
b.	——	iii. 112 *seqq.* (pp. 23–25) . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 309 *seqq.*
c.	——	iii. 127	Virg. Aen. vi. 563.
c.	——	iv. 57, 58 (p. 56)	Gen. xxvi. 5.
b.	——	iv. 60	Gen. xxix. 20, 28.
c.	——	iv. 121	Virg. Aen. viii. 134–137.
c.	——	iv. 124	Virg. Aen. xi. 657, 662.
b.	——	iv. 125, 126	Virg. Aen. vii. 72.
b.	——	iv. 140, 141 (p. 192) . . .	Virg. Ecl. iv. 55, 56.
b.	——	v. 4, 5	Virg. Aen. vi. 432–433.
b.	——	v. 7.	Matt. xxvi. 24.
c.	——	v. 7–10 (p. 183)	Virg. Aen. vi. 566–569.
c.	——	v. 46, 47	Virg. Aen. x. 264–266.
b.	——	v. 52–59 (p. 280) . . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. I. iv. 4–8.
c.	——	v. 60	Ps. xcv. 10.
b.	——	v. 61, 62; 69 (p. 172) . . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 442, 450.
b.	——	v. 62.	Virg. Aen. iv. 552.
c.	——	v. 66 (p. 189)	Virg. Aen. vi. 57 [1].
b.	——	v. 82–84 (p. 184)	Virg. Aen. v. 213–217 [2].
b.	——	v. 121–123 (p. 282) . . .	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. iv.
b.	——	v. 124–126 (p. 283) . . .	Virg. Aen. ii. 10–13.
b.	——	vi. 14, 22 *seqq.*	Virg. Aen. vi. 417 *seqq.*
c.	——	vi. 65	1 Sam. xxv. 26.
c.	——	vii. 25 [3]	Virg. Aen. vi. 610, 611.
c.	——	vii. 64–66 (p. 286)	Boeth. Cons. II. Met. ii. ll. 1–8.
c.	——	vii. 84	Virg. Ecl. iii. 93 (?).
c.	——	vii. 88–90	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. i. (*sub med. & fin.*).
b.	——	vii. 91–93 (p. 285)	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. ii. (*init.*)
c.	——	vii. 94–96 (p. 285)	Boeth. Cons. II. Met. i. ll. 5–7.
c.	——	vii. 106 (p. 180)	Virg. Aen. vi. 323 [4].
c.	——	viii. 25–30	Virg. Aen. vi. 412–414.
b.	——	viii. 45	Luke xi. 27.
b.	——	viii. 70–72	Virg. Aen. vi. 630, 631.
c.	——	viii. 78	Virg. Aen. vi. 554, 630, 631.

[1] Probably as amplified in the note of Servius. [2] Comp. vi. 190–192; 202, 3. [3] Comp. Purg. xx. 11. [4] Comp. l. 369.

c.	Inferno viii. 97	Prov. xxiv. 16.
c.	—— viii. 120	Virg. Aen. vi. 534.
b.	—— ix. 22–26 (p. 235)	Luc. Phars. vi. 507 *seqq.*
c.	—— ix. 37–42	Virg. Aen. vi. 280, 281 [1].
c.	—— ix. 38–42 (p. 245)	Stat. Theb. i. 103, 113, 115.
c.	—— ix. 48 (p. 181)	Virg. Aen. x. 761.
c.	—— ix. 70 (p. 193)	Virg. Georg. ii. 441 (?).
c.	—— ix. 82 *seqq.* (p. 246) . . .	Stat. Theb. ii. 1–6.
c.	—— ix. 94–97	Acts ix. 5.
c.	—— ix. 98–99	Virg. Aen. vi. 395, 396.
b.	—— x. 1 (p. 193)	Virg. Aen. vi. 443.
b.	—— x. 11	Joel iii. 2, 12.
c.	—— x. 25 (p. 76)	Matt. xxvi. 73.
c.	—— x. 58, 59	Virg. Aen. vi. 734.
c.	—— x. 58–60, 68 (p. 178) . . .	Virg. Aen. iii. 310–312.
c.	—— x. 69	Eccles. xi. 7.
c.	—— x. 80	Virg. Aen. vi. 397.
b.	—— xi. 22–27 (p. 259)	Cic. De Off. I. xiii. 41.
b.	—— xi. 43, 44 (p. 95)	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 5 (1120 *a.* 1–3).
c.	—— xi. 47	Ps. xiii. 1 (*or* Ps. lii. 1).
a.	—— xi. 79–82	Ar. Eth. VII. i. 1 (1145 *a.* 16).
a.	—— xi. 83, 84	Ar. Eth. VII. viii. 5 (1151 *a.* 24).
a.	—— xi. 101 *seqq.* (p. 95) . . .	Ar. Phys. II. ii. (194 *a.* 21) [2].
a.	—— xi. 101 *seqq.*	Ar. Phys. II. viii. (199 *a.* 15).
a.	—— xi. 106–108	Gen. ii. 15.
a.	—— xi. 106–108	Gen. iii. 19.
c.	—— xii. 12, 13	Virg. Aen. vi. 24–26 [3].
b.	—— xii. 40–45	Matt. xxvii. 51.
b.	—— xii. 63 [4]	Virg. Aen. vi. 389.
b.	—— xii. 66–69 (p. 213) . . .	Ovid Met. ix. 101–108, 130–132.
c.	—— xii. 107 (p. 262)	Cic. de Off. II. vii. 25.
c.	—— xii. 107 (p. 263)	Val. Max. IX. xiii. Ext. 3, 4.
b.	—— xiii. 10–12 (p. 182) . . .	Virg. Aen. iii. 245–257.
b.	—— xiii. 13–15	Virg. Aen. iii. 209–218.
b.	—— xiii. 31 *seqq.* (p. 182) . . .	Virg. Aen. iii. 26 *seqq.*
c.	—— xiii. 58–60 (p. 77)	Is. xxii. 22.
c.	—— xiii. 140 (p. 179)	Virg. Aen. vi. 497.
b.	—— xiv. 14, 15.	Luc. Phars. ix. 371–378.
c.	—— xiv. 28, 29 (p. 22) . . .	Gen. xix. 24.
c.	—— xiv. 51–60 (p. 249) . . .	Stat. Theb. x. 883 *seqq.* [5]
c.	—— xiv. 52, 55 (p. 250) . . .	Stat. Theb. ii. 599.
c.	—— xiv. 94–102	Virg. Aen. iii. 104, 105; 111, 112.
b.	—— xiv. 106 *seqq.*	Dan. ii. 32, 33.
c.	—— xiv. 119 (p. 180)	Virg. Aen. vi. 323.

[1] Add perhaps Georg. iv. 482. [2] Comp. Meteor. IV. iii. (381 *b.* 6); and add II. vii. (199 *a.* 15). [3] This seems the most probable source for this allusion, the story of Pasiphae being only briefly referred to in Ovid Metam., viz. viii. 131–3. [4] Comp. Purg. ix. 85. [5] Especially ll. 889, 904, 909, 927.

c.	Inferno	xv. 17–19	Virg. Aen. vi. 452–455 [1].
c.	——	xv. 38 (p. 168)	Virg. Aen. vi. 329.
c.	——	xv. 46, 47	Virg. Aen. vi. 531–534.
c.	——	xv. 55 (p. 175)	Virg. Aen. vi. 95.
c.	——	xv. 65, 66	Matt. vii. 16.
c.	——	xv. 82	Virg. Aen. iv. 4.
c.	——	xv. 93, 94 (p. 175) . . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 103–105.
c.	——	xvi. 84	Virg. Aen. i. 203.
c.	——	xvii. 74 (p. 77)	Is. lvii. 4.
b.	——	xvii. 106	Ovid Met. ii. 200.
c.	——	xvii. 107, 108	Ar. Meteor. I. viii. (345 *a.* 15).
b.	——	xvii. 109–111	Ovid Met. viii. 225–232.
c.	——	xviii. 91 (p. 223)	Ovid Her. vi. 40.
c.	——	xviii. 130 *seqq.* (p. 22) . .	Ecclus. ix. 10.
b.	——	xviii. 133–5 (p. 261) . . .	Cic. De Amic. xxvi. 98.
b.	——	xix. 1–4	Acts viii. 18 *seqq.*
c.	——	xix. 12 [2].	Rev. xix. 2.
a.	——	xix. 85, 86	2 Macc. iv. 7 *seqq.*
a.	——	xix. 91, 92	Matt. xvi. 19.
a.	——	xix. 93	Matt. iv. 19.
a.	——	xix. 93	John xxi. 19.
b.	——	xix. 94–96	Acts i. 23–26.
a.	——	xix. 106–111 (p. 70) . .	Rev. xvii. 1–3.
c.	——	xix. 112	Hosea viii. 4.
b.	——	xx. 32–36 (p. 246) . .	Stat. Theb. vii. 794 *seqq.*, & esp. viii. 27, 84.
b.	——	xx. 40–45	Ovid Met. iii. 324–331.
b.	——	xx. 46, 47 (p. 242) . . .	Luc. Phars. i. 586.
b.	——	xx. 55 *seqq.* (p. 174) . . .	Virg. Aen. x. 198–200.
a.	——	xx. 112, 113	Virg. Aen. ii. 114 *seqq.*
c.	——	xxi. 79–82.	Virg. Aen. vi. 368–369.
b.	——	xxi. 112–114 [3]	Matt. xxvii. 51.
c.	——	xxii. 54	Luke xvi. 2.
a.	——	xxiii. 4 (p. 294)	Aesop Fab. (?)
c.	——	xxiii. 92	Matt. vi. 16.
a.	——	xxiii. 115–117	John xi. 49, 50; *or* xviii. 14.
b.	——	xxiii. 121.	John xviii. 13.
b.	——	xxiii. 143, 144	John viii. 44.
c.	——	xxiv. 49–51	Wisd. v. 15.
c.	——	xxiv. 53, 54	Virg. Aen. vi. 730–732.
b.	——	xxiv. 85–87 [4] (p. 238) . . .	Luc. Phars. ix. 710–720.
b.	——	xxiv. 108–110 (p. 222) . .	Ovid Met. xv. 393–400.
c.	——	xxv. 17, 25 (p. 175) . . .	Virg. Aen. viii. 194.
b.	——	xxv. 24 (p. 175)	Virg. Aen. viii. 251–255.
b.	——	xxv. 26, 27	Virg. Aen. viii. 192–7 (& l. 231).
b.	——	xxv. 69–78 (p. 213) . . .	Ovid Met. iv. 373–379.
a.	——	xxv. 94, 95	Luc. Phars. ix. 763–804.

[1] Comp. l. 270. [2] Comp. ll. 3, 4; 108. [3] See *Time Reff.* pp. 46 *seqq.* [4] With *pestilenze* in l. 88 compare Lucan, ll. 724, 734, 805 *seqq.*

a.	Inferno xxv. 97, 98	Ovid Met. iv. 570–588.
a.	—— xxv. 97, 98	Ovid Met. v. 572 *seqq.*
c.	—— xxv. 112–114	Ovid Met. v. 455–458.
b.	—— xxv. 133–137	Ovid Met. iv. 585–588.
c.	—— xxvi. 7 (p. 217)	Ovid Heroid. xix. 195, 196.
c.	—— xxvi. 24 (p. 82)	Ecclus. xiv. 6.
a.	—— xxvi. 34	2 Kings ii. 24.
b.	—— xxvi. 35–39	2 Kings ii. 11, 12.
c.	—— xxvi. 42	James iii. 6.
b.	—— xxvi. 52–54 (p. 248) . . .	Stat. Theb. xii. 429–432.
b.	—— xxvi. 58–60	Virg. Aen. ii. 183–198.
b.	—— xxvi. 61, 62	Stat. Achill. i. 537 *seqq.* & ii. *init.*
b.	—— xxvi. 63	Virg. Aen. ii. 163–170.
c.	—— xxvi. 80, 81	Virg. Aen. iv. 317.
b.	—— xxvi. 91, 92 (p. 216) . . .	Ovid Met. xiv. 308.
b.	—— xxvi. 92–93	Virg. Aen. vii. 1–4.
c.	—— xxvi. 94, 95 (p. 182) . . .	Virg. Aen. ii. 137, 138.
c.	—— xxvi. 97–99	Hor. A. P. l. 142 (?).
c.	—— xxvi. 139	Virg. Aen. i. 116–117.
c.	—— xxvii. 7–12 (pp. 215, 296) .	Ovid Ars Am. I. 652–656.
c.	—— xxvii. 7–12 (p. 215) . . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. I. xx. 1–4 (?).
c.	—— xxvii. 7–12 (p. 296) . . .	Val. Max. IX. ii. Ext. 9.
b.	—— xxvii. 75	Cic. De Off. I. xiii. 41.
a.	—— xxviii. 11, 12 (p. 274) . .	Livy XXIII. xii.
c.	—— xxviii. 64–66	Virg. Aen. vi. 495–497.
b.	—— xxviii. 97–99 (p. 228) . .	Luc. Phars. i. 278–282.
c.	—— xxviii. 101, 102 (p. 229) . .	Luc. Phars. i. 269, 271.
b.	—— xxviii. 137, 138	2 Sam. xv. 12 *seqq.*
b.	—— xxix. 58–66	Ovid Met. vii. 528 *seqq.*
b.	—— xxx. 4–12 (p. 212)	Ovid Met. iv. 511–529.
b.	—— xxx. 15–21	Ovid Met. xiii. 404–406 [1].
b.	—— xxx. 37 *seqq.*	Ovid Met. x. 298 *seqq.*
c.	—— xxx. 62, 63	Luke xvi. 24, 25.
b.	—— xxx. 97	Gen. xxxix. 14 *seqq.*
b.	—— xxx. 98, 113 *seqq.*	Virg. Aen. ii. 77 *seqq.*, 149–161 [2].
b.	—— xxx. 128	Ovid Met. iii. 407 *seqq.*
c.	—— xxxi. 4–6 (p. 302)	Ovid Met. xiii. 171, 172; *or* Rem. Amor. ll. 47, 48.
c.	—— xxxi. 10 (p. 84)	Zech. xiv. 6, 7 (?).
c.	—— xxxi. 31, 32, 42–45 (p. 173) .	Virg. Aen. vi. 580, 581.
c.	—— xxxi. 55–57 (p. 101) . . .	Ar. Pol. I. ii. 15, 16 (1253 *a.* 31–5) [3].
c.	—— xxxi. 61 (p. 77)	Gen. iii. 7.
b.	—— xxxi. 77, 78 (p. 73) . . .	Gen. x. 9, 10. (Comp. xi. 9.)
b.	—— xxxi. 98	Stat. Theb. ii. 596.
b.	—— xxxi. 115–118 (p. 233) . .	Luc. Phars. iv. 587–602.
b.	—— xxxi. 119–121 (p. 234) . .	Luc. Phars. iv. 596, 597.
c.	—— xxxi. 124 (p. 234)	Luc. Phars. iv. 595, 596.

[1] Add ll. 448 *seqq.* and 536, 567–569. [2] Especially comp. l. 149 with Inf. xxx. 114. [3] Comp. Ar. Eth. VII. vi. 7 (1150 *a.* 4, 5).

c.	Inferno xxxi. 132 (p. 234)	Luc. Phars. iv. 633.
c.	—— xxxii. 10, 11	Hor. A. P. ll. 394, 395.
c.	—— xxxii. 88 (p. 190)	Virg. Aen. i. 242 *seqq.*[1]
b.	—— xxxii. 130–2 (p. 248) . . .	Stat. Theb. viii. 739 *seqq.*
c.	—— xxxiii. 4	Virg. Aen. ii. 3.
b.	—— xxxiii. 122 *seqq.*[2] (p. 81) . .	Ps. liv. 16.
c.	—— xxxiii. 124	1 Macc. xvi. 11–17[3].
c.	—— xxxiv. 67 (p. 266)	Cic. In Catil. III. vii. 16 (?).
c.	—— xxxiv. 111	Ar. De Coelo IV. i. (308 *a.*16, 30).
c.	—— xxxiv. 113	Gen. i. 9, 10.
b.	—— xxxiv. 121 (p. 76)	Rev. xii. 8, 9.

PURGATORIO.

b.	Purgatorio i. 9 (p. 221)	Ovid Met. v. 338, 339.
b.	—— i. 11	Ovid Met. v. 298 *seqq.*
c.	—— i. 31 *seqq.* (p. 170) . .	Virg. Aen. viii. 670.
b.	—— i. 79 *seqq.* (p. 232) . .	Luc. Phars. ii. 338–345.
c.	—— i. 80 (p. 232)	Luc. Phars. ix. 561.
c.	—— i. 94–96; 124 *seqq.* . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 635, 636.
c.	—— i. 117	Virg. Aen. vii. 9.
c.	—— i. 134–136 (p. 170) . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 143, 144.
c.	—— ii. 7–9 (p. 226)	Ovid Met. vi. 47–49.
a.	—— ii. 46	Ps. cxiii. 1.
b.	—— ii. 80 (p. 168)	Virg. Aen. vi. 700.
c.	—— ii. 94–102 (p. 168) . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 313–330.
b.	—— iii. 121, 2	John vi. 37 (?).
c.	—— iii. 130	Virg. Aen. vi. 362.
c.	—— iii. 138	Virg. Aen. vi. 327, 328.
c.	—— iv. 1 *seqq.* (p. 102) . .	Ar. Eth. X. v. 3, 4 (1175 *b.* 1).
c.	—— iv. 5, 6 (p. 163) . . .	Plato Timaeus, 69 C. *seqq.*
c.	—— iv. 56, 120; v. 5 (p. 239)	Luc. Phars. iii. 248 (*or* ix. 539).
c.	—— iv. 134, 135	Matt. xv. 8, 9.
c.	—— iv. 138, 139 (p. 225) . .	Ovid Met. ii. 142, 143.
a.	—— v. 24	Ps. l. 3 *seqq.*
c.	—— v. 37–39 (p. 132) . . .	Ar. Meteor. I. iv. (341 *b.* 1 *seqq.*)
c.	—— v. 74	Lev. xvii. 14.
c.	—— v. 75 (p. 190)	Virg. Aen. i. 242–249.
c.	—— v. 109–111 (p. 133) . .	Ar. Meteor. I. ix. (346 *b.* 23–31)[4].
c.	—— v. 112–114	Eph. ii. 2.
c.	—— v. 115–118 (p. 300) . .	Ar. Meteor. II. iv. (360 *b.* 33 *seqq.*).
a.	—— vi. 28–30	Virg. Aen. vi. 376.
c.	—— vi. 78	Lam. i. 1, *or* Is. i. 21.
c.	—— vi. 92, 93	Matt. xxii. 21.
c.	—— vi. 109 (p. 48)	Luke xxi. 25[5].

[1] As explained in the note of Servius. [2] Comp. Conv. IV. vii. l. 103.
[3] Hence the name '*Tolomea.*' [4] Comp. II. iv. (360 *a.* 20, 21; *b.* 30–35).
[5] Comp. John xvi. 33.

c.	Purgatorio vi. 125 (p. 231) . . .	Luc. Phars. i. 313.
c.	—— vii. 40–42 (p. 169) . . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 673–678.
c.	—— vii. 44	John xii. 35[1].
c.	—— vii. 82, 83 (p. 170) . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 656, 657.
c.	—— vii. 88–90	Virg. Aen. vi. 754, 755.
c.	—— vii. 114	Is. xi. 5[2].
c.	—— vii. 117	Jer. xlviii. 11.
c.	—— viii. 25, 26	Gen. iii. 24.
c.	—— viii. 95[3]	1 Pet. v. 8.
b.	—— viii. 99	Gen. iii. 4–6.
c.	—— ix. 1, 2	Virg. Aen. iv. 584, 5; ix. 460, 1.
b.	—— ix. 6 (p. 224)	Ovid Met. xv. 371[4].
c.	—— ix. 17 (p. 267)	Cic. De Sen. xxii. 80.
c.	—— ix. 20–24	Virg. Aen. v. 254–257.
b.	—— ix. 34 *seqq.*[5] (p. 245) . .	Stat. Achill. i. 247–250.
c.	—— ix. 111	Luke xviii. 13.
c.	—— ix. 112	Rev. xiii. 16; xx. 4.
c.	—— ix. 132	Luke ix. 62.
b.	—— ix. 136–138 (p. 231) . .	Luc. Phars. iii. 153–155, 167, 168.
b.	—— x. 34–45	Luke i. 28–38.
b.	—— x. 55–69	2 Sam. vi. 3–7, 12–16.
b.	—— x. 59 (p. 78)	2 Sam. vi. 12.
b.	—— x. 65 (p. 57)	2 Sam. vi. 14.
c.	—— x. 120 (p. 49)	Luke xviii. 13.
b.	—— xi. 1–21	Matt. vi. 9–13[6].
c.	—— xi. 2	1 Kings viii. 27.
c.	—— xi. 6 (p. 61)	Wisd. vii. 25.
c.	—— xi. 63	Ecclus. xl. 1 (*fin.*).
c.	—— xi. 103–108 (p. 287) . .	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. vii. (*med.*)
c.	—— xi. 115	Is. xl. 6 (*fin.*).
c.	—— xi. 116, 117 (p. 79) . .	Cant. i. 5.
c.	—— xii. 5, 6	Ovid Her. xiii. 101 (?).
b.	—— xii. 26, 27 (p. 76) . .	Luke x. 18.
b.	—— xii. 28–33 (p. 250) . .	Stat. Theb. ii. 595–599.
b.	—— xii. 33 (p. 250)	Ovid Met. x. 150, 151.
b.	—— xii. 34–36	Gen. xi. 2 *seqq.*[7]
b.	—— xii. 37–39 (p. 208) . .	Ovid Met. vi. 182, 3; 192; 301, 2.
b.	—— xii. 40	1 Sam. xxxi. 4.
b.	—— xii. 41, 42	2 Sam. i. 21.
b.	—— xii. 43–45 (p. 208) . .	Ovid Met. vi. 140–151.
b.	—— xii. 46–48	1 Kings xii. 14, 18.
b.	—— xii. 50, 51	Stat. Theb. ii. 265 *seqq.*
b.	—— xii. 52–54	2 Kings xix. 37[8].
b.	—— xii. 55–57	Oros. Adv. Pag. II. vii. 6.
b.	—— xii. 59–60 (p. 59) . . .	Judith xiv. 4, 16: xv. 1.
b.	—— xii. 61 (p. 179)	Virg. Aen. iii. 2, 3.

[1] Comp. John ix. 4. [2] Comp. Prov. xxxi. 17. [3] Comp. Purg. xi. 20.
[4] Comp. Fast. iv. 163. [5] Comp. Inf. xii. 71. [6] Comp. Luke xi. 2–4.
[7] Compared with x. 9, 10; xi. 9. [8] Or ‖ in 2 Chron. and Isaiah.

a.	Purgatorio	xii. 110	Matt. v. 3.
c.	——	xii. 121–123.	Ecclus. x. 15.
a.	——	xiii. 29	John ii. 3.
b.	——	xiii. 32	Cic. De Amic. vii. 24; *or* De Fin. V. xxii. 63.
a.	——	xiii. 36	Matt. v. 44.
c.	——	xiii. 59	Gal. vi. 2. (?)
c.	——	xiii. 96	Heb. xi. 13.
c.	——	xiv. 31 (p. 240). . . .	Luc. Phars. ii. 396-398.
c.	——	xiv. 32, 33	Luc. Phars. ii. 437, 438 [1].
c.	——	xiv. 40–42	Virg. Aen. vii. 19, 20.
c.	——	xiv. 85	Gal. vi. 8.
b.	——	xiv. 133 (p. 49) . . .	Gen. iv. 14.
b.	——	xiv. 139 (p. 208) . . .	Ovid Met. ii. 708 *seqq.*
b.	——	xiv. 143 (p. 59) . . .	Ps. xxxi. 9.
c.	——	xiv. 145	Eccles. ix. 12.
b.	——	xiv. 151	2 Macc. ix. 5.
b.	——	xv. 15 [2] (p. 113) . . .	Ar. De An. II. xii. (424 *a.* 29).
a.	——	xv. 38.	Matt. v. 7.
c.	——	xv. 61 *seqq.*	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. v. ll. 15–17.
c.	——	xv. 64–66	Boeth. Cons. I. Pros. vi. (*fin.*).
b.	——	xv. 87–92	Luke ii. 46–48.
c.	——	xv. 94–105 (p. 296) . .	Val. Max. V. i. Ext. 2.
c.	——	xv. 98	Ovid Met. vi. 70–82.
b.	——	xv. 106–114 (p. 84) . .	Acts vii. 54 *seqq.*
b.	——	xvi. 99	Lev. xi. 3, 4, *or* Deut. xiv. 6, 7.
c.	——	xvi. 100–102	Ar. Eth. I. v. 3 (1095 *b.* 19–22) [3].
c.	——	xvi. 114	Luke vi. 44.
b.	——	xvi. 131, 132	Numb. xviii. 20.
c.	——	xvii. 3	Ar. Hist. An. i. 9. (491 *b.* 28–34).
b.	——	xvii. 19, 20 (pp. 209, 210)	Ovid Met. vi. 609, 623.
b.	——	xvii. 25–30 (p. 76) . .	Esth. v. 14; vii. 10.
b.	——	xvii. 34–39	Virg. Aen. xii. 604 *seqq.*
b.	——	xvii. 53 [4]	Ar. De An. II. xii. (424 *a.* 29).
a.	——	xvii. 68, 69	Matt. v. 9.
c.	——	xvii. 94 *seqq.*	Ar. Eth. III. xi. 3, 4 (1118 *b.* 15–22).
c.	——	xvii. 114	Gen. ii. 7.
c.	——	xviii. 18	Matt. xv. 14.
b.	——	xviii. 28 [5].	Ar. Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20).
c.	——	xviii. 91–93	Stat. Theb. ix. 434 *seqq.* [6]
b.	——	xviii. 100.	Luke i. 39.
b.	——	xviii. 101, 102 (p. 230) .	Luc. Phars. iii. 453–455 [7].
b.	——	xviii. 133–135	Numb. xiv. 22, 23; 29, 30.
b.	——	xviii. 136–138	Virg. Aen. v. 711–718.
c.	——	xix. 19–24 (p. 264) . .	Cic. De Fin. V. xviii. 49.

[1] Comp. also Virgil Aeneid iii. 414 *seqq.* [2] Comp. also Purg. viii. 36; xvii. 53; and Ar. Prob. AA. 2 (960 *a.* 21 *seqq.*). [3] Comp. X. vi. 3, 4 (1176 *b.* 16). [4] Comp. also Purg. viii. 36. [5] Comp. Phys. ii. 1 and many other places. [6] Ismenus *loquitur.* [7] Add B. iv. *init.*

a.	Purgatorio	xix. 50	Matt. v. 5.
a.	——	xix. 73	Ps. cxviii. 25.
b.	——	xix. 133–135	Rev. xix. 10 *or* xxii. 9.
a.	——	xix. 137	Matt. xxii. 30.
b.	——	xx. 22–24	Luke ii. 7.
c.	——	xx. 25 (p. 188)	Virg. Aen. vi. 845[1].
b.	——	xx. 26, 27	Prov. xvi. 8.
b.	——	xx. 88–91	Matt. xxvii. 34, 38–41.
c.	——	xx. 94, 95	Ps. lvii. 11.
b.	——	xx. 103–105	Virg. Aen. i. 346–364.
b.	——	xx. 106–108	Ovid Met. xi. 100–145.
b.	——	xx. 109–111	Josh. vii. 18 *seqq.*
b.	——	xx. 112	Acts v. 1–10.
b.	——	xx. 113	2 Macc. iii. 25 *seqq.*
b.	——	xx. 115 (p. 212) . . .	Ovid Met. xiii. 429–438[2].
b.	——	xx. 130–132	Ovid Met. vi. 185–192.
a.	——	xx. 136, 139, 140 . . .	Luke ii. 9, 14.
b.	——	xxi. 1–3	John iv. 13.
a.	——	xxi. 7–9	Luke xxiv. 13–15, 32.
c.	——	xxi. 41, 42 (p. 181) . .	Virg. Aen. viii. 349, 350.
c.	——	xxi. 49 *seqq.* (p. 131) .	Ar. Meteor. II. ix. (370 *a.* 25–32).
c.	——	xxi. 50	Ovid Met. xiv. 845[3].
c.	——	xxi. 56 (p. 131) . . .	Ar. Meteor. II. viii. (366*b.*15 *seqq.*).
b.	——	xxi. 82–84 (p. 280) . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. VII. iii. 8; ix. 8.
c.	——	xxi. 88 (p. 256) . . .	Juv. vii. 82–87.
c.	——	xxi. 93	Stat. Achill. ii. 452[4].
c.	——	xxi. 94–99 (p. 243) . .	Stat. Theb. xii. 816, 817.
a.	——	xxii. 4–6	Matt. v. 6.
a.	——	xxii. 40, 41 (p. 186) . .	Virg. Aen. iii. 56, 57.
c.	——	xxii. 58 (p. 244) . . .	Stat. Theb. i. 41 (*or* x. 630, 631).
c.	——	xxii. 60	Heb. xi. 6.
c.	——	xxii. 67–69 (p. 293) . .	S. Aug. Conf. IV. xvi.
c.	——	xxii. 70–72 (p. 176) . .	Virg. Ecl. iv. 5–7.
c.	——	xxii. 97, 98 (p. 198) . .	Hor. Epist. II. i. 58, 9 (& A. P. 54).
c.	——	xxii. 103	Virg. Aen. vi. 734.
b.	——	xxii. 112	Stat. Theb. iv. 716 *seqq.*
c.	——	xxii. 128, 129 (p. 77) . .	Ps. cxviii. 130.
b.	——	xxii. 142–144	John ii. 3.
b.	——	xxii. 145 (p. 296) . . .	Val. Max. II. i. 5.
b.	——	xxii. 146, 147	Dan. i. 8–17.
c.	——	xxii. 148–150 (p. 217) .	Ovid Met. i. 89 *seqq.*; 101–112.
b.	——	xxii. 151, 152	Matt. iii. 4; *or* ‖ in Mark.
a.	——	xxiii. 11	Ps. l. 17.
b.	——	xxiii. 22–27 (p. 211) . .	Ovid Met. viii. 777 *seqq.*[5]
a.	——	xxiii. 74	Matt. xxvii. 46.

[1] Possibly as amplified in the note of Servius. [2] See also Virg. Aen. iii. 49 *seqq.* [3] Comp. iv. 479; and perhaps Cic. De Nat. Deor. III. xx.: 'Thaumante dicitur [Arcus] esse natus.' [4] See note in Index I. [5] Especially ll. 803–810, 875–878.

c.	Purgatorio	xxiv. 4 (p. 60) . . .	Jude 12.
c.	——	xxiv. 28 (p. 211) . . .	Ovid Met. viii. 825–827.
c.	——	xxiv. 101 (p. 181) . . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 200.
b.	——	xxiv. 115	Gen. ii. 17.
b.	——	xxiv. 121–123	Ovid Met. xii. 210 *seqq.*
b.	——	xxiv. 124–126 (p. 49) .	Judges vii. 7–9.
b.	——	xxiv. 151–154	Matt. v. 6.
b.	——	xxv. 22–24	Ovid Met. viii. 511–524.
b.	——	xxv. 37–39	Ar. De Gen. Anim. I. xviii. (724 *b.* 26); I. xix. (726 *a.* 26, *b.* 3–10); II. iii. (736 *b.* 26).
b.	——	xxv. 40 (p. 137) . . .	Ar. De Gen. Anim. II. i. (735 *a.* 23–26); II. iv. (738 *b.* 16); II. v. (741 *b.* 15).
b.	——	xxv. 40, 41	Ar. De Gen. Anim. I. xix. (726 *b.* 15–19).
b.	——	xxv. 45 (p. 136) . . .	Ar. De Gen. Anim. I. xix. (727 *a.* 2, 25 *seqq.*; II. iii. (737 *a.* 28).
b.	——	xxv. 47	Ar. De Gen. Anim. I. xxi. (729 *b.* 12 *seqq.*); II. iv. (738 *b.* 20).
b.	——	xxv. 49–51 (p. 136) . .	Ar. De Gen. Anim. II. iii. (737 *a.* 21); II. iv. (739 *b.* 20 *seqq.*).
c.	——	xxv. 50, 51 (p. 78) . .	Wisd. vii. 2.
b.	——	xxv. 52, 53 (p. 136) . .	Ar. De Gen. Anim. II. iii. (736, *a.* 34, 736, *b.* 12); III. ii. (753 *b.* 28); V. i. (779 *a.* 1).
c.	——	xxv. 56 (p. 137) . . .	Ar. Hist. Anim. viii. 1 (588 *b.* 10).
b.	——	xxv. 61	Ar. De Gen. Anim. II. iii. (736 *b.* 2).
c.	——	xxv. 64–66 (p. 115) . .	Ar. De An. III. iv. (429 *a.* 22–27); III. v. (430 *a.* 22–25) (?).
c.	——	xxv. 70–72	Gen. ii. 7.
c.	——	xxv. 70–72 (p. 138) . .	Ar. De Gen. Anim. II. iii. (736 *b.* 27).
c.	——	xxv. 83 (p. 292) . . .	S. Aug. De Trin. x. 17, 18.
c.	——	xxv. 91–93	Ar. Meteor. III. iv. (373 *b.* 19–24).
a.	——	xxv. 128	Luke i. 34.
b.	——	xxv. 130 (p. 221) . . .	Ovid Met. ii. 453 *seqq.*; 464, 5.
b.	——	xxvi. 40	Gen. xix. 24 *seqq.*
c.	——	xxvi. 41	Virg. Aen. vi. 24–26.
c.	——	xxvi. 43–45 (p. 240) . .	Luc. Phars. vii. 832–834.
b.	——	xxvi. 77, 78	Suet. Jul. Caes. c. 49 (?)
b.	——	xxvi. 94–96 (p. 247) . .	Stat. Theb. v. 720–722.
a.	——	xxvii. 8	Matt. v. 8.
c.	——	xxvii. 27	Dan. iii. 94[1].
b.	——	xxvii. 37–39	Ovid Met. iv. 145, 6; 158–166.
a.	——	xxvii. 58	Matt. xxv. 34.
b.	——	xxvii. 100–108	Gen. xxix. 16, 17.
c.	——	xxvii. 134, 135 (p. 217) .	Ovid Met. i. 101, 102, 108, &c.
c.	——	xxviii. 23	Virg. Aen. vi. 179.

[1] Comp. Luke xxi. 18.

c.	Purgatorio	xxviii. 33 (p. 60) . . .	Ps. cxx. 6.
b.	——	xxviii. 50, 51 (p. 223) .	Ovid Met. v. 397–399.
b.	——	xxviii. 65, 66 (p. 225) .	Ovid Met. x. 525, 526.
c.	——	xxviii. 69 (p. 217) . . .	Ovid Met. i. 101, 102; 108.
c.	——	xxviii. 71, 72 (p. 232) .	Luc. Phars. ii. 672 *seqq.*
c.	——	xxviii. 73, 74	Ovid Her. xviii. 173, 174 *seqq.*
a.	——	xxviii. 80	Ps. xci. 5.
c.	——	xxviii. 97–99 [1] (p. 131) .	Ar. Meteor. II. iv. (360 *b.* 30–35).
c.	——	xxviii. 97–102 (p. 132) .	Ar. Meteor. I. iii. (341 *a.* 1) [2].
c.	——	xxviii. 118–120	Gen. ii. 9.
c.	——	xxviii. 121, 122 (p. 134) .	Ar. Meteor. I. xiii. (349 *b.* 21 *seqq.*).
c.	——	xxviii. 121–124	Gen. ii. 5, 6.
c.	——	xxviii. 136	Boeth. Cons. III. Pros. x.
c.	——	xxviii. 139–144 (p. 217) .	Ovid Met. i. 89 *seqq.*; 101–112.
a.	——	xxix. 3	Ps. xxxi. 1.
b.	——	xxix. 24–27	Gen. iii. 5, 6 [3].
b.	——	xxix. 40	Virg. Aen. vii. 641 [4].
b.	——	xxix. 43, 50	Rev. i. 12 [5].
b.	——	xxix. 47 (p. 112) . . .	Ar. De An. II. vi. (418 *a.* 7–19) [6].
b.	——	xxix. 47, 48 (p. 112 n.) .	Ar. De An. III. iii. (428 *b.* 20 *seqq.*) [7].
b.	——	xxix. 65, 83	Rev. iv. 4.
c.	——	xxix. 66	Mark ix. 2.
c.	——	xxix. 78	Ezek. i. 28 *or* Rev. iv. 3.
a.	——	xxix. 85, 86	Luke i. 28, 42.
a.	——	xxix. 92–95	Rev. iv. 6–8.
c.	——	xxix. 95, 96 (p. 223) . .	Ovid Met. i. 625–627; 713, 714.
a.	——	xxix. 100–105	Ezek. i. 4–6.
c.	——	xxix. 114 (p. 78) . . .	Cant. v. 10, 11.
c.	——	xxix. 116 (p. 296) . . .	Val. Max. IV. i. 6 (?).
c.	——	xxix. 116	Virg. Aen. viii. 714 *seqq.*
b.	——	xxix. 118, 119	Ovid Met. ii. 107 *seqq.*, 227–232, 272 *seqq.*
c.	——	xxix. 136–138	Col. iv. 14.
a.	——	xxx. 11	Cant. iv. 8.
c.	——	xxx. 13, 14	1 Cor. xv. 52.
a.	——	xxx. 19	Matt. xxi. 9 [8].
a.	——	xxx. 21	Virg. Aen. vi. 884.
c.	——	xxx. 22, 23 (p. 226) . .	Ovid Met. ii. 112, 113 (?).
c.	——	xxx. 40, 41	Cant. iv. 9.
b.	——	xxx. 48 (p. 21 n.) . . .	Virg. Aen. iv. 23.
c.	——	xxx. 49–51 (p. 21) . .	Virg. Georg. iv. 525–527.
c.	——	xxx. 73 *seqq.* (p. 286) .	Boeth. Cons. I. Pros. ii.
c.	——	xxx. 74, 75	Ps. xxiii. 3, 4.
a.	——	xxx. 83, 84	Ps. xxx. 2–9.

[1] Comp. Inf. ix. 68. [2] Comp. Purg. xxi. 43 *seqq.* [3] Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 14. [4] Also x. 163. [5] Comp. iv. 5. [6] Comp. 428 *b.* 20 *seqq.* [7] Especially comp. 428 *b.* 29 with Purg. xxix. 48. [8] *Or* ‖ in SS. Mark and Luke.

c. Purgatorio xxx. 131, 132 . . . . Boeth. Cons. III. Pros. ix. *ad fin.*[1]
c. —— xxxi. 20, 21 . . . . . Virg. Aen. xi. 150, 151.
c. —— xxxi. 46 (p. 58) . . . Ps. cxxv. 5.
c. —— xxxi. 51 . . . . . Gen. iii. 19.
b. —— xxxi. 62 (p. 65) . . . Prov. i. 17.
a. —— xxxi. 98 . . . . . Ps. l. 9.
c. —— xxxi. 129 . . . . . Ecclus. xxiv. 29[2].
c. —— xxxi. 139 . . . . . Wisd. vii. 26.
b. —— xxxii. 32 . . . . . Gen. iii. 4–6.
b. —— xxxii. 40–42 (p. 186) . . Virg. Georg. ii. 122–124.
c. —— xxxii. 44, 45 . . . . Rev. x. 9, 10.
c. —— xxxii. 48 . . . . . Matt. iii. 15.
c. —— xxxii. 61, 62 . . . . Rev. xiv. 3.
b. —— xxxii. 64–66 . . . . Ovid Met. i. 682–721.
a. —— xxxii. 73–81 . . . . Matt. xvii. 1–8[3].
c. —— xxxii. 73 . . . . . Cant. ii. 3.
c. —— xxxii. 74 . . . . . 1 Pet. i. 12.
b. —— xxxii. 104, 105 . . . . Rev. i. 11.
c. —— xxxii. 109–111 (p. 130) . Ar. Meteor. II. ix. (369 *a.* 16–21).
c. —— xxxii. 112 . . . . . Virg. Aen. i. 394.
b. —— xxxii. 142–147 . . . . Rev. xiii. 1.
b. —— xxxii. 148 *seqq.* . . . Rev. xvii. 1 *seqq.*
a. —— xxxiii. 1 . . . . . Ps. lxxviii. 1.
a. —— xxxiii. 10–12 . . . . John xvi. 16.
b. —— xxxiii. 35 . . . . . Rev. xvii. 8 *fin.*
b. —— xxxiii. 46–48 . . . . Ovid Met. i. 379–387.
b. —— xxxiii. 49–51 (p. 218) . Ovid Met. vii. 759 *seqq.*
b. —— xxxiii. 69 . . . . . Ovid Met. iv. 158–166.
b. —— xxxiii. 88–90 . . . . Is. lv. 9.
c. —— xxxiii. 112 (p. 284) . . Boeth. Cons. V. Metr. i. ll. 3, 4.

Paradiso.

b. Paradiso i. 6 . . . . . 2 Cor. xii. 4.
c. —— i. 13–18 (p. 244) . . . . Stat. Achill. i. 9–11.
c. —— i. 16–18 (p. 238) . . . . Luc. Phars. v. 72, 73.
b. —— i. 20 . . . . . Ovid Met. vi. 383–391.
c. —— i. 29 (p. 245) . . . . . Stat. Achill. i. 15, 16.
b. —— i. 57 . . . . . Gen. ii. 8, 15.
b. —— i. 68, 69 . . . . . Ovid Met. xiii. 940–949.
b. —— i. 73–75 . . . . . 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3.
c. —— i. 74 (p. 284) . . . . . Boeth. Cons. II. Metr. viii. l. 15.
c. —— i. 115 . . . . . Ar. Gen. Anim. III. xi. (761 *b.* 16–21).
b. —— i. 141 (p. 121) . . . . . Ar. Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20)[4].
c. —— ii. 11 . . . . . Ps. lxxvii. 25[5].
c. —— ii. 11, 12 . . . . . Ecclus. xxiv. 29[2].

[1] 'Haec igitur,' *seqq.* [2] *v.* 21 in E. V. [3] *Or* || in SS. Mark and Luke.
[4] Comp. Phys. ii. 1 (192 *b.* 36) and elsewhere. [5] Comp. Wisd. xvi. 20.

b.	Paradiso	ii. 18 (p. 227)	Ovid Met. vii. 118–120.
b.	——	ii. 95, 96	Ar. Metaph. A. i. (981 *a.* 1–7).
c.	——	ii. 127, 128[1]	Ar. Gen. An. V. viii. (789 *b.* 10–12).
c.	——	ii. 133–135	Boeth. Cons. III. Met. ix. ll. 13, 4 (?).
b.	——	iii. 18	Ovid Met. iii. 417.
b.	——	iv. 13–15	Dan. ii. 10–13, 28 *seqq.*
b.	——	iv. 24, 49 (p. 157) . . .	Plato, Timaeus 41 D, E and 42 B.
c.	——	iv. 29	Jer. xv. 1.
b.	——	iv. 48	Tobit iii. 25.
b.	——	iv. 73	Ar. Eth. III. i. 12 (1110 *b.* 16).
b.	——	iv. 77–78	Ar. Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20)[2].
c.	——	iv. 84	Liv. II. xii.[3]
b.	——	iv. 100–108	Ar. Eth. III. i. 4, 8 (1110 *a.* 4 *seqq.*; 1110 *a.* 26 *seqq.*).
b.	——	iv. 105 (p. 20)	Ovid Met. ix. 407, 408.
b.	——	iv. 106–111	Ar. Eth. III. i. 5, 6 (1110 *a.* 8 *seqq.*).
c.	——	iv. 121–123	Virg. Aen. i. 600–605.
b.	——	v. 49–51	Lev. xxvii. 10–13, 28–33.
b.	——	v. 66 (p. 62)	Judges xi. 31.
c.	——	v. 70 (p. 263)	Cic. De Off. III. xxv. 95.
c.	——	v. 117	Job vii. 1.
c.	——	vi. 7	Ps. xvi. 8 (and similar passages).
b.	——	vi. 21	Ar. Categ. x. *fin.* (13 *b.* 33–35).
b.	——	vi. 36	Virg. Aen. x. 479 *seqq.* & xii. 948.
c.	——	vi. 39	Liv. I. xxiv, xxv.
	——	vi. 40–51	See note 4 *infra.*[4]
b.	——	vi. 58–72 (p. 282) . . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. VI. xv. 1 *seqq.* to xvi. 5, 6.
b.	——	vi. 58–60 (p. 239) . . .	Luc. Phars. i. 399–404; 424, 425; 433, 434; 464.
b.	——	vi. 67, 68	Luc. Phars. ix. 961 *seqq.* 976, 977.
b.	——	vi. 68	Virg. Aen. v. 371.
c.	——	vi. 75	Luc. Phars. i. 41.
c.	——	vi. 76–78	Oros. Adv. Pag. VI. xix. 18[5].
c.	——	vi. 79	Virg. Aen. viii. 686.
c.	——	vi. 81	Oros. Adv. Pag. VI. xxii. 1–5.
b.	——	vi. 92, 93 (p. 280) . . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. VII. iii. 8; ix. 8.
b.	——	vii. 3 (p. 60)	Vulg. Hieron. Prol. 'Galeatus.'
c.	——	vii. 8	Wisd. iii. 7.
c.	——	vii. 39 (p. 50)	John xiv. 6.
b.	——	vii. 48	Matt. xxvii. 51.
c.	——	vii. 64, 65	Boeth. Cons. III. Met. ix. ll. 5, 6.
c.	——	vii. 85, 86	Rom. v. 12.

[1] Comp. Conv. I. xiii. l. 27; IV. iv. l. 122. [2] And often elsewhere.
[3] This being explicitly referred to for Mucius in De Mon. II. v. 126.
[4] The various allusions here are to the commonplaces of Roman history which Dante may have obtained from Livy, Orosius, Valerius Maximus, or second-hand through other sources. Several of them occur also in De Mon. with references to Livy or other authorities. [5] Comp. Aen. viii. 696, 697.

c.	Paradiso vii. 103–105		Ps. xxiv. 10.
c.	—— vii. 112–114		Matt. xxiv. 21.
b.	—— vii. 124		Ar. De Coelo III. vi. (304 *b.* 26).
b.	—— vii. 142, 147, 148		Gen. ii. 7, 21, 22.
b.	—— viii. 9		Virg. Aen. i. 715–719.
c.	—— viii. 22 (p. 132)		Ar. Meteor. III. i. (370 *b.* 32 *seqq.*).
b.	—— viii. 67–70 (p. 216) . . .		Ovid Met. v. 346–353.
a.	—— viii. 113, 114; 120 *seqq.* (p. 99)		Ar. Pol. I. ii. 10 (1253 *a.* 9) *or* De An. III. ix. (432 *b.* 21)[1].
b.	—— viii. 116		Ar. Pol. I. ii. 9 (1253 *a.* 3).
a.	—— viii. 118–120 (p. 99) . . .		Ar. Pol. II. ii. 3 (1261 *a.* 23, 24).
b.	—— viii. 130, 131		Rom. ix. 10–13.
c.	—— viii. 131, 132 (p. 277) . .		Liv. I. iv. Cf. Oros. VI. i. 5.
c.	—— viii. 138		Boeth. Cons. III. Pros. x.[2]
b.	—— ix. 93 (p. 229)		Luc. Phars. iii. 572, 573, 577.
b.	—— ix. 78		Is. vi. 2.
b.	—— ix. 97		Virg. Aen. iv. 68, 101[3].
b.	—— ix. 98		Virg. Aen. iv. 552.
c.	—— ix. 100, 101		Ovid Her. Ep. ii. 1.
b.	—— ix. 116–125		Josh. ii. 1 *seqq.*
c.	—— ix. 123 (p. 62)		Ecclus. xlvi. 3 (?).
c.	—— ix. 129		Wisd. ii. 24.
b.	—— ix. 138		Luke i. 26.
b.	—— x. 14, 15		Ar. Gen. et Cor. II. x. (336 *a.* 32)[4].
b.	—— x. 112–114		1 Kings iii. 12.
c.	—— xi. 32 (p. 63)		Matt. xxvii. 46, 50.
c.	—— xi. 54 (p. 63)		Luke i. 78.
b.	—— xi. 67–69 (p. 229) . . .		Luc. Phars. v. 527–531.
c.	—— xi. 96 (p. 85)		Ps. cxiii. 1 *bis.* (?)
c.	—— xi. 111		Matt. v. 3.
b.	—— xii. 14, 15		Ovid Met. iii. 395–399.
b.	—— xii. 17, 18		Gen. ix. 12–17.
c.	—— xii. 46, 47 (p. 227) . . .		Ovid Met. i. 63, 64.
b.	—— xii. 57 (p. 16)		Eur. Med. 809 (?).
b.	—— xii. 75 (p. 18)		Matt. xix. 21.
b.	—— xii. 84		John vi. 31, 32.
b.	—— xii. 119, 120		Matt. xiii. 30.
c.	—— xii. 128, 129 (p. 64) . . .		Prov. iii. 16.
b.	—— xiii. 13–15		Ovid Met. viii. 174–182.
b.	—— xiii. 37–39		Gen. ii. 21, 22.
b.	—— xiii. 39		Gen. iii. 6.
c.	—— xiii. 61–63 (p. 110) . . .		Ar. De Mundo vi. (397 *b.* 26).
b.	—— xiii. 64–66		Ar. Metaph. Z. vii. (1032 *a.* 26–31).
b.	—— xiii. 76–78 (p. 154) . . .		Ar. Phys. II. viii. (199 *a.* 33 *seqq.*).
a.	—— xiii. 93		1 Kings iii. 5.
c.	—— xiii. 97 (pp. 117, 163) . .		Plato Tim. 39 E and 40 A.
c.	—— xiii. 97		Ar. Metaph. Λ. viii. (1073 *a.* 14 *seqq.*).

[1] And often elsewhere. [2] Super haec, inquit, &c. [3] Comp. also iv. 2. [4] Comp. Metaph. Λ. v. (1071 *a.* 15).

c.	Paradiso xiii. 98, 99 (p. 117) . . .		Ar. Anal. Pr. I. xvi. (35*b.* 23 *seqq.*).
c.	—— xiii. 100 (p. 117)		Ar. Phys. VIII. i. ii. (esp. 251*b.* 10–5).
b.	—— xiii. 125 (p. 118)		Ar. Soph. Elench. xi. (171 *b.* 16 *seqq.*; 172 *a.* 4).
b.	—— xiii. 125 (p. 117)		Ar. Phys. I. iii. *init.* (186 *a.* 7)[1].
b.	—— xiv. 36		Luke i. 28 *seqq.*
c.	—— xiv. 97–99		Ar. Meteor. I. viii. (345*a.* 11 *seqq.*).
b.	—— xiv. 106		Matt. xvi. 24 and ‖ passages.
c.	—— xiv. 112–117 (p. 295) . .		Lucr. ii. 115, 116. (?)
a.	—— xv. 26[2]		Virg. Aen. vi. 684–691.
c.	—— xv. 28 (p. 179)		Virg. Aen. vi. 836.
c.	—— xv. 62, 63		Ps. cxxxviii. 3.
c.	—— xv. 88		Prov. iii. 12[3].
c.	—— xv. 88		Matt. iii. 17 (and ‖ s).
c.	—— xv. 107 (p. 257)		Juv. Sat. x. 362.
b.	—— xvi. 34		Luke i. 28.
b.	—— xvii. 1–3		Ovid Met. i. 755 *seqq.*
c.	—— xvii. 22–27 (p. 175) . .		Virg. Aen. vi. 103–105.
b.	—— xvii. 24 (p. 96)		Ar. Eth. I. x. 11 (1100 *b.* 21).
b.	—— xvii. 33.		John i. 29.
b.	—— xvii. 46, 47		Ovid Met. xv. 493–505.
c.	—— xvii. 52 (p. 287)		Boeth. Cons. I. Pros. iv. *ad fin.*[4]
c.	—— xvii. 61 *seqq.*		Ecclus. viii. 18 *seqq.*
c.	—— xvii. 130–132		Boeth. Cons. III. Pros. i. (ll. 11–13).
c.	—— xviii. 30.		Ezek. xlvii. 12[5].
c.	—— xviii. 58–60		Ar. Eth. II. iii. 1 (1104 *b.* 4 *seqq.*).
b.	—— xviii. 73–78 (p. 239) . .		Luc. Phars. v. 711–716.
a.	—— xviii. 91–93 (p. 239) . .		Wisd. i. 1.
b.	—— xviii. 121, 122		Matt. xxi. 12[6].
c.	—— xviii. 124		Luke ii. 13[7].
c.	—— xviii. 134		Luke i. 80.
b.	—— xviii. 135		Matt. xiv. 6–8[8].
c.	—— xix. 40		Prov. viii. 27.
c.	—— xix. 104		Acts iv. 12.
c.	—— xix. 106–108		Matt. vii. 21–23.
c.	—— xix. 109–111		Matt. xii. 41[9].
c.	—— xix. 113		Rev. xx. 12.
b.	—— xix. 131, 132		Virg. Aen. iii. 707–711.
b.	—— xx. 39		2 Sam. vi. 1–17.
b.	—— xx. 51 (p. 72)		2 Kings xx. 1–6 and 2 Chron. xxxii. 26.
c.	—— xx. 68, 121 (p. 171) . . .		Virg. Aen. ii. 426, 427.
a.	—— xx. 94		Matt. xi. 12.
c.	—— xxi. 6		Ovid Met. iii. 308, 309.
c.	—— xxi. 28–33		Gen. xxviii. 12.

[1] Comp. De Coelo III. i. (298 *b.* 21). [2] Comp. ll. 88, 89. [3] See note *sup.* p. 327. [4] 'At vero hic,' *seqq.* [5] Comp. Rev. xxii. 2. [6] Or ‖ in other Evangg. [7] 'Militia caelestis.' [8] Or ‖ in S. Mark. [9] Comp. viii. 11, 12 and perhaps Acts viii. 27.

b.	Paradiso	xxi. 127	Acts ix. 15.
c.	——	xxi. 129	Luke x. 7, 8.
b.	——	xxii. 70–72	Gen. xxviii. 12.
c.	——	xxii. 76, 77	Jer. vii. 11.
b.	——	xxii. 77	Matt. xxi. 13[1].
b.	——	xxii. 88	Acts iii. 6.
b.	——	xxii. 94 (p. 50)	Ps. cxiii. 3, 5.
c.	——	xxii. 108	Luke xviii. 13.
b.	——	xxii. 116 (p. 140) . . .	Ar. Phys. II. ii. *fin.* (194 *b.* 13)[2].
c.	——	xxii. 134–138; 151 . . .	Cic. Somn. Scip. xvi. *fin.*; xix. *init.*[3]
c.	——	xxii. 142	Ovid Met. iv. 192, 241.
c.	——	xxii. 151	Boeth. Cons. II. Metr. vii. ll. 1–6.
c.	——	xxiii. 37	1 Cor. i. 24.
c.	——	xxiii. 38	Heb. x. 20.
c.	——	xxiii. 40–42 (p. 130) . . .	Ar. Meteor. ii. 9 (369 *a.* 19 *seqq.*)[4].
b.	——	xxiii. 73, 74	John i. 14.
c.	——	xxiii. 73, 74	Cant. ii. 1, 16 (?).
c.	——	xxiii. 75	2 Cor. ii. 14–16.
b.	——	xxiii. 134, 135	Ps. cxxxvi. 1.
b.	——	xxiv. 1	Rev. xix. 9.
a.	——	xxiv. 38, 39 (p. 73) . . .	Matt. xiv. 28.
c.	——	xxiv. 49–51	1 Pet. iii. 15[5].
c.	——	xxiv. 62[6]	2 Pet. iii. 15.
a.	——	xxiv. 64, 65	Heb. xi. 1.
c.	——	xxiv. 90	Heb. xi. 6[7].
c.	——	xxiv. 106–108 (p. 293) . .	S. Aug. De Civ. Dei XXII. v. *fin.*
b.	——	xxiv. 125, 126 (p. 72) . .	John xx. 3–5.
b.	——	xxiv. 130–132[8]	Ar. Metaph. Λ. vii. (1072 *a.* 23–28).
b.	——	xxiv. 130–132 (p. 116) . .	Ar. Metaph. Λ. vii. (1072 *a.* 23–28 & *b.* 3) and viii. (1073 *a.* 23–35).
b.	——	xxiv. 136	Luke xxiv. 44.
c.	——	xxv. 29, 30	James i. 5, 17.
b.	——	xxv. 38	Ps. cxx. 1.
c.	——	xxv. 56	Heb. xii. 22.
c.	——	xxv. 57	Job vii. 1.
a.	——	xxv. 73, 98 (p. 66) . . .	Ps. ix. 11.
a.	——	xxv. 91 (p. 66)	Is. lxi. 7, 10.
b.	——	xxv. 94, 95	Rev. vii. 9, 13.
c.	——	xxv. 112, 113	John xiii. 23.
c.	——	xxv. 114	John xix. 27.
c.	——	xxv. 121–126	John xxi. 22, 23.
c.	——	xxv. 133–135 (p. 248) . .	Stat. Theb. vi. 799–801.
b.	——	xxvi. 12	Acts ix. 17.
c.	——	xxvi. 17	Rev. i. 8.

[1] Or ‖ passages. Comp. also Jer. vii. 11. [2] Comp. Metaph. Λ. v. (1071 *a.* 15). [3] The context also being similar. [4] Add Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a. seqq.*) and elsewhere. [5] See note *sup.* p. 333. [6] See note on ll. 49–51. [7] Comp. Rom. xiv. 23. [8] Comp. for the sentiment Conv. II. vi. ll. 151–4, ‘solo intendendo,’ &c.

b.	Paradiso xxvi. 38 (p. 115)	Ar. Met. Λ. viii. (1073 *a.* 23–35)[1].
a.	—— xxvi. 42	Exod. xxxiii. 19.
b.	—— xxvi. 43–45 (p. 86–89) . .	John iii. 16 (?).
b.	—— xxvi. 69	Is. vi. 3, *or* Rev. iv. 8.
c.	—— xxvi. 85–87 (p. 249) . . .	Stat. Theb. vi. 854–857.
b.	—— xxvi. 122	Gen. v. 5.
b.	—— xxvi. 126	Gen. xi. 6–9.
b.	—— xxvi. 137, 8 (p. 197) . . .	Hor. A. P. ll. 60, 61 ; 70, 71.
c.	—— xxvii. 28, 29 (p. 227) . .	Ovid Met. iii. 183, 184.
b.	—— xxvii. 35, 36	Matt. xxvii. 45.
b.	—— xxvii. 55	Matt. vii. 15.
c.	—— xxvii. 84	Ovid Met. ii. 868 *seqq.*
b.	—— xxvii. 137, 138 (p. 140) . .	Ar. Phys. II. ii. *fin.* (194 *b.* 13).
c.	—— xxviii. 2	Virg. Aen. xi. 182. Cf. Georg. iii. 66.
c.	—— xxviii. 16	Ar. Metaph. Λ. vii. (1073 *a.* 5–7).
b.	—— xxviii. 23, 24 (p. 134) . .	Ar. Meteor. III. iii. *init.* (372 *b.* 15–18, 23, 24).
c.	—— xxviii. 32	Ovid Met. i. 270.
b.	—— xxviii. 42	Ar. Metaph. Λ. vii. (1072 *b.* 13, 14).
c.	—— xxviii. 110, 111	Ar. Eth. X. vii. *fin.* ; viii. *init.* (1178 *a.* 7–9).
b.	—— xxix. 21	Gen. i. 2.
b.	—— xxix. 23	Gen. i. 31.
c.	—— xxix. 28–30 (p. 79) . . .	Ecclus. xviii. 1.
b.	—— xxix. 31–36 (p. 109) . . .	Ar. De An. II. ii. (414 *a.* 14–18).
c.	—— xxix. 79–81 (p. 112) . . .	Ar. Mem. i. (450 *a.* 25–32 & *b.* 10–29).
b.	—— xxix. 97	Matt. xxvii. 45.
a.	—— xxix. 133–135	Dan. vii. 10.
c.	—— xxx. 129	Rev. vii. 9, 13.
c.	—— xxxi. 32, 33	Ovid Met. ii. 500–530 ; esp. ll. 506, 7. Cf. Fasti iii. 107, 8.
b.	—— xxxii. 4–6 (p. 292) . . .	S. Aug. Serm. (App.) cxx. 4 ; cxciv. 2.
a.	—— xxxii. 12	Ps. l. 3.
c.	—— xxxii. 31	Matt. xi. 11 ; comp. Luke vii. 28.
a.	—— xxxii. 67–70 (p. 65) . . .	Rom. ix. 10–13 *or* Gen. xxv. 22–25.
a.	—— xxxii. 94, 95	Luke i. 28.
b.	—— xxxiii. 65, 66	Virg. Aen. iii. 441–452.

VITA NUOVA.

a.	Vita Nuova ii. l. 51 (p. 11) . . .	Hom. Il. xxiv. 259.
a.	—— vii. l. 41	Lam. i. 12[2].
a.	—— xxiii. l. 55	Mark xi. 10.
a.	—— xxiv. l. 38	John i. 23 (& ‖ s).
a.	—— xxv. l. 15	Ar. Metaph. Λ. i, ii. (1069 *b.* 3, 24).

[1] Add Met. Λ. vii. (1072 *a.* 23–28, & *b.* 3). [2] See note *sup.* p. 327.

a.	Vita Nuova	xxv. l. 76 *seqq.* . . .	Virg. Aen. i. 65, 76, 77.
a.	——	xxv. l. 87	Luc. Phars. i. 44.
a.	——	xxv. l. 93 (p. 197) . .	Hor. A. P. l. 141.
c.	——	xxv. l. 91 (p. 198) . .	Hor. A. P. l. 359.
a.	——	xxv. l. 84	Virg. Aen. iii. 94.
a.	——	xxv. ll. 95–97	Ovid Rem. Am. l. 2.
a.	——	xxix. *init.*, xxxi. l. 8 . .	Lam. i. 1.
a.	——	Epist. viii. l. 1	Lam. i. 1.
a.	——	xxv. l. 93	Hom. Od. i. 1. (from Horace).
a.	——	xlii. l. 30	Ar. Metaph. A. *min.* i. (993 *b.* 10).
c.	——	xliii. l. 16.	Matt. xviii. 10.
c.	——	xliii. l. 17.	Rom. ix. 5.

Convito.

a.	Convito I.	i. l. 1.	Ar. Metaph. 1. i. *init.* (980 *a.* 22).
c.	——	i. l. 52	Ps. lxxvii. 25 [1].
c.	——	i. l. 55	Ar. Eth. VIII. i. 3 *fin.* (1155 *a.* 22).
c.	——	i. l. 70	Matt. xv. 27 [2].
c.	——	i. ll. 71 *seqq.*	Virg. Aen. I. 630.
c.	——	ii. l. 30	Matt. xviii. 15.
c.	——	ii. l. 31	Ar. Rhet. I. xi. (1371 *b.* 18–20).
a.	——	ii. ll. 95 *seqq.*	Boeth. Cons. I. Pros. iv.
c.	——	iii. l. 32 (p. 287) . . .	Boeth. Cons. I. Pros. iv. [3]
c.	——	iii. ll. 63–65	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 20 (1120 *b.* 13).
c.	——	iii. ll. 63–65	Ar. Eth. IX. vii. 3 (1168 *a.* 1–3).
a.	——	iii. l. 75 (p. 191) . . .	Virg. Aen. iv. 175.
c.	——	iv. l. 11	Ar. Eth. I. iii. 7 (1095 *a.* 6–8).
c.	——	iv. ll. 17–21	Ar. Eth. X. viii. 11 *fin.* (1179 *a.* 16).
a.	——	iv. l. 67	S. Aug. Conf. I. vii. *sub init.* (?)
a.	——	iv. l. 81	John iv. 44 (‖ in other Gospels).
c.	——	v. ll. 71 *seqq.*	Ar. Eth. II. vi. 2, 3 (1106 *a.* 15).
c.	——	vii. l. 59 (p. 141) . . .	Ar. Eth. V. i. 12 (1129 *b.* 11–14) (?).
b.	——	viii. ll. 11 *seqq.*	Sen. De Benef. IV. ix, xi, xii.
c.	——	viii. ll. 13–15	Ar. Eth. I. ii. 8 (1094 *b.* 8–10).
a.	——	viii. l. 121	Sen. De Benef. II. i. *fin.*
c.	——	ix. l. 45 [4] (p. 199) . . .	Hor. Carm. III. iii. 49 (?).
a.	——	ix. ll. 61, 62	Ar. Eth. I. vii. 16 (1098 *a.* 18).
a.	——	xi. ll. 30 *seqq.* (p. 51) .	Matt. xv. 14.
b.	——	xi. ll. 46 *seqq.* (p. 104) .	Ar. Eth. II. i. 1 (1103 *a.* 14–17).
a.	——	xi. l. 56	Boeth. Cons. III. Pros. vi. (ll. 15–7).
a.	——	xi. l. 95	Cic. De Fin. I. i. 1, 2.
b.	——	xi. ll. 140, 141 (p. 104) .	Ar. Eth. IV. iii. 3, 7 (1123 *b.* 2, 9).
a.	——	xii. l. 21	Ar. Eth. VIII. iii. 6, 8 (1156 *b.* 7 *seqq.*; 26 *seqq.*).

[1] Comp. Wisdom xvi. 20. [2] Comp. Luke xvi. 21. [3] 'At vero hic,' &c. [4] Comp. Conv. IV. xii. l. 83.

a.	Convito I. xii. l. 19 *seqq.*		Cic. De Amic. v. 19 *med.* & vi. 20 *fin.*
a.	——	xii. l. 24	Cic. De Amic. ix. 29[1].
a.	——	xii. l. 75 (p. 103) . . .	Ar. Eth. V. ?
c.	——	xiii. l. 27	Ar. Gen. Anim. v. 8 (789 *b.* 10–12).
b.	——	xiii. ll. 82–84	John vi. 13.
b.	——	xiii. l. 87	Luke i. 79.
b.	——	II. i. l. 25	Ovid Met. xi. 1 *seqq.*
a.	——	i. l. 46	Matt. xvii. 1, and ‖ s in Mark and Luke.
a.	——	i. l. 57	Ps. cxiii. 1.
a.	——	i. l. 107	Ar. Phys. I. i. (184 *a.* 16 *seqq.*).
a.	——	iii. l. 14	Ar. Part. Anim. I. v. (644 *b.* 24–35).
b.	——	iii. ll. 19 *seqq.* (pp. 124–7)	Ar. De Coelo II. x. (291 *a.* 31), & xii. (292 *a.* 7–9).
a.	——	iii. l. 29 (pp. 124–7) . .	Ar. De Coelo II. xii. (292 *a.* 10 *seqq.*).
a.	——	iii. l. 31	Ar. Metaph. Λ. viii. (1073 *b.* 3–16).
a.	——	iii. l. 60 (p. 143) . . .	Ar. De Coelo II. xii. (292 *a.* 4).
a.	——	iv. l. 33 (pp. 126, 127) .	Ar. De Coelo I. iii. (270 *b.* 5–9), & ix. (278 *b.* 14, 15).
a.	——	iv. l. 42 (p. 69) . . .	Ps. viii. 2.
a.	——	v. l. 13	Ar. Metaph. Λ. viii. (1074 *a.* 14–*b.* 3) ; add 1073 *a.* 34–*b.* 3.
a.	——	v. ll. 13 *seqq.*	Ar. De Coelo I. viii. (276 *a.* 18) & (277 *a.* 11, *b.* 13, 27).
c.	——	v. ll. 21 *seqq.*[2] (p. 163) .	Plato Tim. 39 E ; 40 A ; 69 C.[3]
b.	——	v. ll. 82–86	Ar. Eth. X. viii. 13 (1179 *a.* 23 *seqq.*).
a.	——	v. ll. 91 *seqq.*	Ar. Eth. X. viii. 7 (1178 *b.* 7 *seqq.*).
a.	——	v. l. 119	Ar. Metaph. Λ. *min.* i. (993 *b.* 9–11).
a.	——	vi. l. 6	Heb. i. i.
a.	——	vi. l. 17	John i. 5, 9.
b.	——	vi. ll. 23–25	Luke i. 26, 27.
a.	——	vi. l. 26	Matt. xxvi. 53.
a.	——	vi. l. 30	Matt. iv. 6, 11 *or* ‖ in S. Luke.
a.	——	vi. l. 34	Cant. viii. 5.
a.	——	vi. l. 103 (p. 52) . . .	Ps. xviii. 2.
a.	——	vi. l. 120 (p. 187) . . .	Virg. Aen. i. 664, 665.
a.	——	vi. l. 122	Ovid Met. v. 365.
c.	——	vii. ll. 53 *seqq.*	Cic. De Off. II. xiv. 48.
c.	——	viii. ll. 24, 25	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 9 (1178 *a.* 2–4).
a.	——	viii. l. 27	Boeth. Cons. IV. Pros. iii. *ad fin.*
a.	——	ix. l. 63 (p. 113) . . .	Ar. De An. II. ii. (413 *b.* 26) *or* III. v. (430 *a.* 23).
a.	——	ix. l. 67	Cic. De Sen. xxi. 77, 78.
a.	——	ix. l. 78 (p. 152) . . .	Ar. Hist. An. viii. 1 (588 *a.* 25–30).

[1] 'Quanquam confirmatur,' &c. [2] See *s. v.* Plato, p. 343. [3] Compare also Cic. Orator c. iii ; & St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, VII. xxviii.

a.	Convito II.	ix. l. 115	John xiv. 6.
a.	——	x. l. 66 (p. 114) . . .	Ar. De An. II. ii. (414 *a.* 25).
a.	——	xi. l. 18	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. i.
a.	——	xi. l. 82	Eccles. v. 12.
b.	——	xiv. ll. 31 *seqq.* (p. 157) .	Plato Tim. p. 41 D, E, and 42 B.
b.	——	xiv. ll. 35, 36	Ar. Gen. An. II. iii. (736 *b.* 33 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xiv. l. 42	Ar. Eth. VI. ii. 3 (1139 *a.* 27, 8).
a.	——	xiv. l. 87	Hor. A. P. ll. 70, 71.
b.	——	xiv. l. 139	Ar. Metaph. A. iv. (1070 *b.* 18).
a.	——	xiv. l. 144 (p. 120) . .	Ar. Metaph. I. v. (986 *a.* 16–21).
b.	——	xiv. l. 169 (p. 135) . .	Ar. Meteor. I. iii. (340 *b.* 13); iv. (341 *b.* 23 *seqq.*); *or* v. (342 *b.* 1).
a.	——	xiv. l. 174 (p. 289) . .	Sen. Nat. Quaest. I. i; *or* vii. 17.
c.	——	xiv. ll. 187 *seqq.* (p. 102)	Ar. Eth. X. v. 3, 4 (1175 *b.* 1 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xiv. l. 198	Ptolemy. (?)
a.	——	xiv. l. 209	Euclid. (?)
a.	——	xiv. l. 240	Ar. De An. I. i. *init.* (402 *a.* 1 *seqq.*)
a.	——	xiv. l. 251	Ptolemy. (?)
a.	——	xv. ll. 40–42 (p. 153) .	Ar. Phys. V. i. *fin.* (225 *b.* 8).
b.	——	xv. ll. 45 *seqq.* (pp. 127, 314 *seqq.*). .	Ar. Meteor. I. viii. (345 *a.* 11 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xv. l. 54	Ovid Met. ii. 35 *seqq.*
c.	——	xv. l. 115	1 Cor. x. 11; comp. Heb. ix. 26.
a.	——	xv. l. 128 (p. 103) . .	Ar. Eth. V. ii. 10, 11 (1130 *b.* 22–4)[1]. ?
a.	——	xv. l. 171	John xiv. 27.
a.	——	xv. l. 175	Cant. vi. 7, 8.
a.	——	xvi. l. 91	Ar. Metaph. A. i. (980 *a.* 22–27).
c.	——	III. i. ll. 39 *seqq.*	Cic. De Amic. xx. 74.
c.	——	i. ll. 40 *seqq.*	Ar. Eth. VIII. vi. 7 (1158 *b.* 1 *seqq.*), & viii. 5 (1159 *b.* 2–7).
a.	——	i. l. 56	Ar. Eth. IX. i. 1 (1163 *b.* 32).
a.	——	i. l. 78	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. i.[2]
a.	——	ii. l. 27	De Causis, Lect. XX. *in.* (p. 501 A)[3].
a.	——	ii. l. 31	De Causis, Lect. XX. (p. 501 B).
a.	——	ii. l. 52	De Causis, Lect. IV. *init.* (p. 476 B).
a.	——	ii. ll. 83 *seqq.*	Ar. De An. II. ii. (413 *b.* 11–13).
a.	——	ii. ll. 124 *seqq.* (p. 143) .	Ar. De An. III. ix. (432 *a.* 15, 31). ?
b.	——	ii. ll. 126–128 (p. 144) .	Ar. Eth. VI. i. 6 (1139 *a.* 12, 13).
a.	——	ii. l. 144 (p. 288) . . .	Boeth. Cons. I. Pros. iv.
a.	——	ii. l. 146.	Boeth. Cons. III. Met. ix. ll. 6–8.
c.	——	iii. l. 9 (p. 122) . . .	Ar. De Coelo I. viii. (277 *b.* 14).
c.	——	iii. l. 9 (p. 122) . . .	Ar. Meteor. II. ii. (355 *a.* 35).
c.	——	iii. l. 11 (p. 122) . . .	Ar. De Gen. Anim. III. xi. (761 *b.* 16–21).
c.	——	iii. l. 21	Ar. Hist. Anim. VIII. i. (588 *b.* 6).
a.	——	iii. l. 51	Ovid Met. ix. 183.
a.	——	iii. l. 53	Luc. Phars. iv. 642 *seqq.*

[1] Apparently quoted in combination or confusion with Eth. I. ii. 5 (1094 *a.* 27 *seqq.*). [2] 'Neque enim,' &c. [3] Comp. Lect. XXIV. *med.* p. 504 A.

b.	Convito III. iii. l. 82 (p. 144) . . .		Ar. Eth. III. x. 8 (1118 *a.* 26).
a.	——	iii. l. 90	Ar. Eth. VIII. iii. 6 (1156 *b.* 7); comp. iv. 3 (1157 *a.* 20).
a.	——	iv. l. 54	Ar. Eth. III. i. 1 (1109 *b.* 31).
b.	——	iv. ll. 57–59	Ar. Eth. III. i. 12 (1110 *b.* 16).
b.	——	iv. l. 62	Ar. Eth. III. v. 15 (1114 *a.* 23).
a.	——	iv. l. 76	Ps. xcix. 3.
b.	——	iv. ll. 87–91	Ar. De An. III. iii. (427 *b.* 15, 16).
b.	——	v. ll. 29–54 (p. 127) . .	Ar. De Coelo II. xiii. (293 *a.* 20 to *b.* 3, and *b.* 20 & 30 *seqq.*).
b.	——	v. ll. 45 *seqq.*	Ar. De Coelo II. xiii. (293 *b.* 30–2).
a.	——	v. ll. 53 *seqq.*	Ar. De Coelo II. viii. (289 *b.* 5, 6).
a.	——	v. ll. 53 *seqq.*	Ar. De Coelo II. xii. (292 *b.* 20).
a.	——	v. ll. 53 *seqq.*	Ar. De Coelo II. xiv. (296 *b.* 15, 22).
a.	——	v. l. 45 (p. 160) . . .	Plato Tim. 40 B.[1]
a.	——	v. ll. 116 *seqq.* (p. 239) .	Luc. Phars. ix. 438–445, 531, 532.
a.	——	vi. l. 41	De Causis, Lect. VIII. (p. 484 D, E).
a.	——	vi. l. 111	Ar. De An. II. i. (412 *a.* 19–22).
a.	——	vi. l. 114	De Causis . . . . (?).
a.	——	vii. l. 17	De Causis, Lect. XX. (p. 501 B).
a.	——	vii. l. 89	Ar. Eth. VII. i. 2 (1145 *a.* 23).
a.	——	viii. l. 14 (p. 52) . .	Ecclus. i. 3.
a.	——	viii. l. 16	Ecclus. iii. 22.
a.	——	viii. l. 85	Ar. Rhet. II. iv, vi, vii, viii, x, xi.
a.	——	viii. l. 94 (p. 255) . .	Stat. Theb. I. 47.
a.	——	viii. l. 108	Sen. (Pseudo) De IV Virtt. c. (?).
c.	——	viii. ll. 160 *seqq.* . . .	Ar. Eth. III. xi. 1 (1118 *b.* 8).
a.	——	viii. ll. 164–170 . . .	Ar. Eth. II. i. 4, 5 (1103 *a.* 31 *seqq.*).
a.	——	viii. ll. 165–169 . . .	Ar. Eth. II. iii. 1 (1104 *b.* 4 *seqq.*).
c.	——	viii. l. 181 (p. 145) . .	Ar. Eth. VII. x. 4 (1152 *a.* 31).
c.	——	viii. l. 181	Ar. Rhet. I. xi. 3 (1370 *a.* 6, 7).
c.	——	viii. l. 209	Wisd. ix. 9.
c.	——	ix. ll. 39, 40	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 20 (1120 *b.* 13), & vii. 3 (1168 *a.* 1–3).
a.	——	ix. l. 53	Ar. De An. II. vii. (418 *a.* 29; *b.* 2); & De Sens. et Sensib. iii. (439 *a.* 18–21).
b.	——	ix. ll. 59–63 (pp. 112, 146) . . .	Ar. De An. II. vi. (418 *a.* 7–19).
c.	——	ix. ll. 72, 92	Ar. Hist. An. I. ix. (491 *b.* 21).
b.	——	ix. ll. 83–86 (p. 140) .	Ar. De Part. An. II. x. (656 *b.* 16–31)[2].
b.	——	ix. ll. 90–93	Ar. De Anim. II. vii. (418 *b.* 26).
c.	——	ix. ll. 91–95	Ar. De Gen. An. V. i. (780 *b.* 22–6).
b.	——	ix. l. 100 (p. 161) . .	Plato Tim. 45 C.
a.	——	ix. l. 105	Ar. De Sens. et Sensib. ii. (437 *b.* 11–16).
a.	——	ix. ll. 107–114 . . .	Ar. De Coelo II. viii. (289 *b.* 30–34).

[1] Probably through Aristotle De Coelo II. xiii. (293 *b.* 30). Cf. Cic. Acad. II. xxxix. 123. [2] Comp. Hist. Anim. I. xi. (492 *a.* 21).

a.	Convito III.	x. ll. 13–17	Ar. Gen. et Cor. I. vi. (322 *b.* 22–9).
a.	——	xi. l. 6 (p. 147) . . .	Ar. Phys. I. i. (184 *a.* 12).
a.	——	xi. l. 12 (p. 147) . .	Ar. Metaph. Γ. vii. (1012 *a.* 23).
a.	——	xi. l. 26 (p. 281) . . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. VII. iii. 1.
a.	——	xi. l. 31 (p. 277) . . .	Liv. I. xviii.
c.	——	xi. ll. 35 *seqq.* (p. 293) .	S. Aug. De Civ. Dei xviii. 25, 37 (add viii. 2)[1].
b.	——	xi. l. 62	Ar. Metaph. A. i. *init.* (980 *a.* 22).
a.	——	xi. l. 75	Ar. Eth. VIII. ii. 4 (1156 *a.* 2–4).
a.	——	xi. ll. 80, 90	Ar. Eth. VIII. ii. 1 (1155 *b.* 19).
a.	——	xi. l. 91	Ar. Eth. VIII. iii. 2 (1156 *a.* 17 & *b.* 7–11).
b.	——	xi. ll. 114, 115 . . .	Ar. Eth. VIII. iii. 9 (1156 *b.* 33).
a.	——	xi. l. 128	Prov. viii. 17.
a.	——	xi. l. 141 (p. 148) . .	Ar. Eth. IX. ix. 10 (1170 *b.* 11 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xi. ll. 158 *seqq.* (p. 194)	Virg. Aen. II. 281, 282.
a.	——	xi. ll. 165 *seqq.* . . .	Stat. Theb. v. 609.
c.	——	xii. l. 84	Wisd. vii. 29.
c.	——	xii. ll. 100 *seqq.* . . .	Wisd. vii. 25, 26.
b.	——	xiii. ll. 50 *seqq.* . . .	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 4 (1177 *a.* 27 *seqq.*), and viii. 6 (1178 *b.* 3 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xiv. l. 58	Ecclus. xxiv. 14.
a.	——	xiv. l. 62	Prov. viii. 23.
a.	——	xiv. l. 63	John i. 1, 2.
c.	——	xiv. l. 74 (p. 198) . .	Hor. A. P. l. 297.
a.	——	xiv. ll. 79 *seqq.* . . .	Ar. Eth. I. vi. 1 (1096 *a.* 14–17).
a.	——	xiv. l. 98	Ar. Metaph. I. ii. (982 *b.* 25–27).
c.	——	xv. l. 30	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 7 *fin.* (1177 *b.* 25).
c.	——	xv. ll. 37–39	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 9 (1178 *a.* 2–4).
a.	——	xv. l. 45	Wisd. iii. 11.
a.	——	xv. ll. 47–50	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 3, 9 *fin.* (1177 *a.* 23 *seqq.*; 1178 *a.* 5–8).
a.	——	xv. l. 54	Wisd. vii. 26.
b.	——	xv. l. 73	Ar. Metaph. A. i. *init.* (980 *a.* 22).
a.	——	xv. ll. 81, 91	Ar. Pol. I. ii. 10 (1253 *a.* 9)[2].
a.	——	xv. l. 130	Ar. Eth. I. vii. 15 (1098 *a.* 16–8).
b.	——	xv. l. 162	Wisd. ix. 9.
a.	——	xv. ll. 167 *seqq.* (p. 53)	Prov. viii. 27–30.
a.	——	xv. l. 190	Prov. iv. 18.
c.	——	xv. ll. 205 *seqq.* . . .	Ecclus. iv. 18, 19; & vi. 21, 22.
a.	——	Canz. III. St. v. l. 85 . .	Ar. Eth. II. vi. 15 (1106 *b.* 36).
b.	——	IV. i. l. 6 (p. 260) . . .	Cic. De Off. I. xvii. 56.
b.	——	i. l. 17 (p. 260) . . .	Cic. De Off. I. xvi. 51.
a.	——	ii. l. 47	Ar. Phys. IV. xi. (220 *a.* 25).
a.	——	ii. l. 74	Eccles. iii. 7.

[1] Cf. also perhaps Cic. Tusc. Disp. v. 3 *ad fin.*; but I do not think Dante elsewhere makes any use of this work. [2] Also De An. III. 9 (432 *b.* 21) and elsewhere.

a.	Convito IV.	ii. ll. 83–87	James v. 7.
a.	——	ii. l. 139	Ar.Eth.VII.xiv.3(1154*a*.22–5)(?).
c.	——	ii. ll. 156–162	Ar. Metaph. A. ix. (1074 *b*. 34).
a.	——	iii. l. 64	Ar. Eth. I. viii. 7 (1098 *b*. 28, 9)[1].
a.	——	iv. l. 9	Ar. Pol. I. ii. 9 (1253 *a*. 3)[2].
b.	——	iv. l. 10 *seqq*.	Ar. Pol. I. ii. 5–8 (1252 *b*. 13 *seqq*.).
a.	——	iv. l. 46	Ar. Pol. I. v. 3 (1254 *a*. 28).
a.	——	iv. l. 117	Virg. Aen. I. 278, 279.
c.	——	iv. l. 122	Ar.Gen.Anim.V. viii. (789*b*.10–2).
a.	——	v. l. 14	Prov. viii. 6.
a.	——	v. l. 43	Is. xi. 1.
b.	——	v. ll. 51 *seqq*. (p. 279) .	Oros. Adv. Pag. VI. xxii. 5 *seqq*.
a.	——	v. l. 64	Luke ii. 1.
c.	——	v. l. 91 (p. 195) . . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 818.
c.	——	v. l. 108 (p. 188) . .	S. Aug. De Civ. Dei V. xviii.
c.	——	v. ll. 110–115	Cic. De Sen. xvi. 55, 56.
c.	——	v. ll. 122, 123 (p. 196) .	Virg. Aen. vi. 825.
c.	——	v. ll. 124 *seqq*. . . .	Cic. De Off. I. xiii. 39.
c.	——	v. l. 140 (p. 232) . . .	Luc. Phars. ix. 561.
c.	——	v. l. 140	Virg. Aen. vi. 842.
a.	——	v. l. 143 (p. 60) . . .	Vulg. Hieronymi Prol. 'Paulino.'
c.	——	v. ll. 161 *seqq*. (p. 275) .	Liv. V. xlvii.
c.	——	v. l. 167 (p. 275) . . .	Liv. XXIII. xii., *or* Oros. Adv. Pag. IV. xvi. 5.
b.	——	vi. l. 62	Ar. Eth. I. i. 4 (1094 *a*. 11).
c.	——	vi. ll. 64–66	Ar. Eth. I. vii. 11 (1097 *b*. 28).
c.	——	vi. ll. 84 *seqq*.	Cic. De Off. III. viii. 35.
a.	——	vi. l. 110	Cic. De Fin. I. ix. 29, 30.
b.	——	vi. l. 120	Ar. Eth. II. vi. 15 (1106 *b*. 36).
b.	——	vi. ll. 125 *seqq*. (p. 268)	Cic. Acad. I. iv. 16, 17.
b.	——	vi. l. 120	Ar. Eth. II. vi. 15 (1106 *b*. 36).
a.	——	vi. l. 164	Wisd. vi. 23.
a.	——	vi. ll. 174 *seqq*. (p. 53) .	Eccles. x. 16, 17.
b.	——	vii. l. 41	John xi. 39.
b.	——	vii. ll. 87 *seqq*. . . .	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. vi. *sub fin.* & III. Pros. iv. *med.*
a.	——	vii. l. 96	Prov. xxii. 28.
a.	——	vii. ll. 98–102 (p. 48) .	Prov. iv. 18, 19.
a.	——	vii. ll. 110 *seqq*. (p. 149)	Ar. De An. II. ii. (413 *a*. 22–*b*. 13).
a.	——	vii. l. 131 (p. 54) . . .	Prov. v. 23.
a.	——	vii. ll. 139 *seqq*. . . .	Ar. De An. II. iii. (414*b*.28–32*seqq*.)
a.	——	viii. ll. 9 *seqq*.	Cic. De Off. I. xxviii. 95 & xxix. 99.
a.	——	viii. l. 43[3]	Ar. Eth. I. viii. 7 (1098 *b*. 28, 9).
b.	——	viii. l. 49 (p. 112) . .	Ar. De An. II. vi. (418 *a*. 7–19).
b.	——	viii. l. 51	Ar. De An. III. iii. (428 *b*. 3).
a.	——	viii. l. 142	Ar. Eth. I. vi. 1 (1096 *a*. 14–17).

[1] Comp. also Ar. Eth. X. ii. 4.

[2] Repeated Ar. Pol. III. vi. 3 (1278 *b*. 19).

[3] See also IV. iii. l. 64.

a.	Convito IV.	ix. ll. 24–27	Ar. De Coelo I. ii. (268 *b.* 11–16), vii. *fin.* (276 *a.* 16, 7), & Ar. Phys. III. i. (*esp.* 200 *b.* 12–21).
b.	——	ix. l. 55	Ar. Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20)[1].
b.	——	ix. l. 57 (p. 119) . . .	Ar. Anal. Pr. II. ii. (53 *b.* 6–10 and 26, 27).
a.	——	ix. l. 83	S. Aug. . . . ? . . . . .
b.	——	ix. l. 167	Matt. xxii. 21.
a.	——	x. l. 83	Ar. Metaph. Z. vii. *init.* (1032 *a.* 13–27)[2].
a.	——	x. l. 90	Ar. Phys. VII. ii. *init.* (243 *a.* 3–6).
a.	——	x. l. 91	Ar. Gen. et Cor. I. ii. (317 *a.* 25); comp. iv. (319 *b.* 8).
a.	——	xi. l. 27 (p. 242) . . .	Luc. Phars. iii. 119–121.
c.	——	xi. l. 54	Ar. Eth. V. iv. 2 (1131 *b.* 27).
a.	——	xi. l. 83 (p. 153) . . .	Aristotle (quoted in error?)
c.	——	xi. ll. 103 *seqq.* . . .	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 21 (1120 *b.* 17).
a.	——	xi. l. 112	Luke xvi. 9.
a.	——	xii. l. 35	Boeth. Cons. II. Metr. v. ll. 27–30.
a.	——	xii. ll. 55 *seqq.* (p. 272)	Cic. Paradoxa, i. 6.
a.	——	xii. l. 74 (p. 286) . .	Boeth. Cons. II. Metr. ii. ll. 1–8.
a.	——	xii. l. 82 (p. 289) . . .	Seneca Epist. cxix. *ad med.*
c.	——	xii. l. 83 (p. 199) . .	Horace Carm. III. iii. 49. (?)
a.	——	xii. l. 120 (p. 288) . .	Seneca Epist. lxxvi. *sub init.*
a.	——	xii. l. 127	Ar. Eth. VI. iii. 2 (1139 *b.* 20).
a.	——	xii. l. 143	Gen. i. 26.
a.	——	xiii. l. 70 (p. 105) . .	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 8 (1177 *b.* 31 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xiii. l. 74 (p. 312) . .	Ar. Eth. I. iii. 4 (1094 *b.* 23–25).
a.	——	xiii. l. 81	Rom. xii. 3.
a.	——	xiii. l. 108 (p. 257) . .	Juv. Sat. x. 22.
b.	——	xiii. l. 108 (p. 258) . .	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. v. *fin.*[3]
a.	——	xiii. ll. 110 *seqq.* (p. 229)	Luc. Phars. v. 527–531.
a.	——	xiii. l. 131	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. v. (l. 9).
c.	——	xiii. ll. 137, 138 . . .	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 11 (1120 *a.* 21, 2).
a.	——	xiii. l. 139	Boeth. Cons. II. Pros. v. (ll. 11, 12).
c.	——	xiii. ll. 147–149 . . .	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 17 (1120 *b.* 1–3).
a.	——	xv. ll. 52–55	Ar. Metaph. A. viii. (1074 *a.* 31–5)?
c.	——	xv. l. 55	Ar. Eth. I. vi. 5 (1096 *b.* 1)?
a.	——	xv. l. 69	Eccles. iii. 21.
a.	——	xv. ll. 76 *seqq.* (p. 220) .	Ovid Met. i. 78–83.
a.	——	xv. l. 114	Ar. De An. III. iii. (427 *a.* 18).
a.	——	xv. l. 123 (p. 269) . .	Cic. De Off. I. xxvi. 91 *fin.*
a.	——	xv. ll. 137 *seqq.* (p. 54)	Prov. xxix. 20.
a.	——	xv. ll. 141–149 . . .	Ar. Eth. I. iv. 6, 7 (1095 *b.* 4 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xv. l. 162	Ar. Phys. I. ii. (185 *a.* 1).
a.	——	xvi. l. 1	Ps. lxii. 12.
a.	——	xvi. l. 8	Wisd. vi. 23.

[1] And often elsewhere. [2] Comp. Phys. I. v. (188 *a.* 31–34). [3] See also *s. v.* Juvenal, *sup.* p. 257.

a.	Convito IV.	xvi. ll. 49 *seqq.* . . .	Eccles. x. 16, 17.
a.	——	xvi. ll. 56–59	Ar. Eth. I. iii. 7 (1095 *a.* 6, 7).
a.	——	xvi. ll. 77 *seqq.* . . .	Ar. Phys. VII. iii. (246 *a.* 13–16).
a.	——	xvi. l. 109	Matt. vii. 15, 16.
a.	——	xvii. l. 9	Ar. Eth. II. vi. 15 (1106 *b.* 36).
a.	——	xvii. l. 33 (p. 149) . .	Ar. Eth. III. xii. 2 (1119 *a.* 23).
a.	——	xvii. ll. 37, 38 . . .	Ar. Eth. III. xi. 8 (1119 *a.* 16).
a.	——	xvii. l. 39	Ar. Eth. II. vii. 4 (1107 *b.* 9).
a.	——	xvii. l. 42	Ar. Eth. II. vii. 6 (1107 *b.* 16 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xvii. ll. 44–49	Ar. Eth. II. vii. 8 (1107 *b.* 22 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xvii. ll. 50–52 (p. 99) .	Ar. Eth. IV. v. 1, 5, 6 (1125 *b.* 26; 1126 *a.* 4–8).
a.	——	xvii. l. 54 (p. 99) . .	Ar. Eth. IV. vi. 1 (1126 *b.* 11).
a.	——	xvii. l. 56	Ar. Eth. IV. vii. 4 (1127 *a.* 24).
a.	——	xvii. l. 60	Ar. Eth. IV. viii. 1 (1127 *b.* 33).
b.	——	xvii. l. 63	Ar. Eth. V. i. 3 (1129 *a.* 8).
a.	——	xvii. l. 71	Ar. Eth. II. vi. 15 (1106 *b.* 36).
b.	——	xvii. l. 73 (p. 100) . .	Ar. Eth. I. x. 12–14 (1101 *a.* 7).
a.	——	xvii. l. 76	Ar. Eth. I. vii. 15 (1098 *a.* 16–18).
b.	——	xvii. ll. 79–84 (p. 99) .	Ar. Eth. I. xiii. 20 (1103 *a.* 6); VI. xiii. 6 (1144 *b.* 30–32); X. viii. 3 (1178 *a.* 16–19).
a.	——	xvii. l. 94	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 9; viii. 1 (1178 *a.* 7–9).
a.	——	xvii. ll. 94 *seqq.* (p. 74)	Luke x. 41, 42.
c.	——	xviii. ll. 23–25 . . .	Ar. Eth. I. xiii. 20 *fin.* (1103 *a.* 9) add I. xii. 6 *init.* (1101 *b.* 31).
c.	——	xviii. l. 40 (p. 133) . .	Ar. De Gen. et Cor. II. iv. (331 *a.* 29–32); *or* Meteor. I. ix. (346 *b.* 29–31).
a.	——	xix. ll. 60–68	Ps. viii. 2, 5–7.
b.	——	xix. l. 80[1]	Ar. Eth. IV. ix. 1 (1128 *b.* 10, 11).
a.	——	xix. l. 83 (p. 100) . .	Ar. Eth. IV. ix. 3, 4 (1128 *b.* 19–23).
a.	——	xx. l. 9	Ar. Eth. II. vi. 15 (1106 *b.* 36).
a.	——	xx. l. 29	Rom. ii. 11.
a.	——	xx. l. 37	Ar. Eth. VII. i. 1 (1145 *a.* 20).
a.	——	xx. l. 37 (p. 11) . . .	Homer, Il. xxiv. 259.
a.	——	xx. l. 51	James i. 17.
a.	——	xx. l. 58	Ar. De An. II. ii. (414 *a.* 11).
b.	——	xxi. l. 17 (p. 157) . .	Plato Tim. 41 D, E; 42 B.
c.	——	xxi. ll. 37–39 (p. 138) .	Ar. Gen. Anim. I. ii. (716 *a.* 5–7), and II. v. (741 *a.* 6 *seqq.*)[2].
c.	——	xxi. ll. 39–42 (p. 138) .	Ar. Gen. Anim. I. xix. (726 *b.* 15–19).
c.	——	xxi. l. 43 (p. 138) . .	Ar. Gen. Anim. II. iii. (736 *b.* 27).
b.	——	xxi. l. 44 (p. 138) . .	Ar. De An. III. iv. (429 *a.* 27–29) add (429 *b.* 30, 31).
a.	——	xxi. l. 56 (p. 89) . . .	Rom. xi. 33.

[1] Comp. also l. 41. [2] See several other passages quoted *sup.* p. 138.

a.	Convito IV.	xxi. ll. 80 *seqq.* . . .	Cic. De Sen. xxi. 77 *med.*
a.	——	xxi. l. 90	De Causis, Lect. IV. (p. 473 D, E).
a.	——	xxi. l. 110	Is. xi. 2, 3.
c.	——	xxi. l. 114	Matt. xiii. 3 *seqq.*
b.	——	xxi. l. 121 (p. 267) . .	Cic. De Fin. III. vii. 23.
c.	——	xxi. ll. 122–125 . . .	Ar. Eth. X. ix. 6 *fin.* (1179 *b.* 24–6).
a.	——	xxi. ll. 126 *seqq.* . . .	Ar. Eth. II. i. 7, 8 (1103 *b.* 13 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xxi. l. 126	S. Aug. . . . . (?) . . . .
a.	——	xxii. l. 15	Ar. Eth. I. ii. 2 (1094 *a.* 23).
a.	——	xxii. l. 16	Cic. De Fin. III. vi. 22 *fin.*
b.	——	xxii. l. 35 (p. 267) . .	Cic. De Fin. V. vi. 17.
a.	——	xxii. l. 56	1 Cor. ix. 24.
a.	——	xxii. ll. 148 *seqq.*; ll. 180 *seqq.*	Mark xvi. 1–7.
a.	——	xxii. ll. 170 *seqq.* . .	Matt. xxviii. 2, 3.
c.	——	xxii. ll. 201 *seqq.* . . .	Ar. Eth. X. vii. *fin.*; viii. *init.* (1178 *a.* 7–9).
c.	——	xxiii. ll. 69–72 (p. 139).	Ar. Gen. An. II. i. (732 *b.* 31 *seqq.*)[1], & De An. II. iv. *ad fin.* (416 *b.* 29), & Juv. et Sen. xviii. (479 *a.* 29).
a.	——	xxiii. l. 79	Ps. ciii. 9.
a.	——	xxiii. ll. 81–87 . . .	Ar. Juv. et Sen. xviii. (479 *a.* 30–2).
a.	——	xxiii. l. 105 (p. 89) . .	Luke xxiii. 44.
b.	——	xxiii. ll. 113 *seqq.* (p. 122)	Ar. De Gen. et Cor. II. ii. *fin.*; iii. *init.* (330 *a.* 24–*b.* 7).
a.	——	xxiii. l. 138	Ovid Met. II. 153, 154.
a.	——	xxiv. l. 62	Cic. De Sen. v. 13.
a.	——	xxiv. l. 93	Cic. De Sen. ii. 4, 5.
a.	——	xxiv. l. 95	Virg. Aen.[2] . . .
a.	——	xxiv. l. 100	Cic. De Off. I. xxxiv. 122, 123.
b.	——	xxiv. l. 106	Ar. De An. III. ix. (432 *b.* 21)[3].
c.	——	xxiv. ll. 107–111 (p. 272)	Cic. De Sen. xv. 52, 53.
a.	——	xxiv. l. 142 (p. 90) . .	Prov. i. 8.
a.	——	xxiv. ll. 145–147 (p. 55)	Prov. i. 10.
a.	——	xxiv. l. 162 (p. 91) . .	Prov. xv. 31.
a.	——	xxiv. l. 171 (p. 90) . .	Col. iii. 20.
a.	——	xxv. l. 7	Ar. Eth. VIII. i. 1 (1155 *a.* 5).
c.	——	xxv. ll. 9, 10	Ar. Eth. VIII. vi. 1, 4 (1158 *a.* 1–6; 20).
a.	——	xxv. l. 17	Prov. iii. 34.
a.	——	xxv. l. 19 (p. 91) . .	Prov. iv. 24.
c.	——	xxv. l. 27	Ar. Eth. IV. ix. 3 (1128 *b.* 16).
c.	——	xxv. l. 60 (p. 256) . .	Juv. Sat. vii. 82–85.
a.	——	xxv. l. 63 (p. 253) . .	Stat. Theb. I. 397 *seqq.* esp. l. 482.
a.	——	xxv. ll. 84 *seqq.* (p. 254)	Stat. Theb. I. 537–539.

[1] All these passages occur in contexts familiar to Dante. [2] This refers to no special passage, but to Dante's allegorical interpretation of the Aeneid generally, as explained more particularly in *c.* xxvi. [3] And often elsewhere.

a.	Convito IV.	xxv. l. 95 (p. 271) . .	Cic. De Off. I. xxxv. 127.
a.	——	xxv. ll. 109–116 (p. 252)	Stat. Theb. I. 671–681.
c.	——	xxvi. l. 37	Ar. Eth. VI. ii. 2 (1139 *a.* 21, 22).
c.	——	xxvi. ll. 38–41 . . .	Ar. Eth. II. iii. 5 (1104 *b.* 21, 22).
c.	——	xxvi. ll. 46–49 . . .	Ar. Eth. III. xii. 8, 9 (1119 *b.* 12 *seqq.*)
a.	——	xxvi. l. 70	Virg. Aen. iv. 272–282[1].
a.	——	xxvi. ll. 71 *seqq.* . . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 261 *seqq.*
b.	——	xxvi. l. 94	Virg. Aen. v. 711–718.
a.	——	xxvi. l. 97	Virg. Aen. v. 548 *seqq.*
a.	——	xxvi. ll. 92 *seqq.*, 111 *seqq.*	Virg. Aen. vi. 175–184.
c.	——	xxvi. ll. 131, 132. . .	Ar. Eth. IV. viii. 10 (1128 *a.* 32).
a.	——	xxvi. l. 136	Virg. Aen. v. 70, 305.
a.	——	xxvii. l. 18 (p. 269) . .	Cic. De Sen. x. 33.
a.	——	xxvii. l. 29.	Ar. Pol. I. ii. 9 (1253 *a.* 3)[2].
a.	——	xxvii. l. 32 (p. 232) . .	Luc. Phars. ii. 383.
a.	——	xxvii. l. 47 (p. 100) . .	Ar. Eth. VI. xiii. 6 (1144 *b.* 30–2).
b.	——	xxvii. l. 50 (p. 101) . .	Ar. Eth. VI. xii. 9 (1144 *a.* 27).
c.	——	xxvii. l. 57	Ar. Eth. VI. ix. 7 (1142 *b.* 31).
a.	——	xxvii. ll. 60 *seqq.* . .	1 Kings iii. 9.
a.	——	xxvii. l. 75 (p. 55) . .	Matt. x. 8.
c.	——	xxvii. ll. 95, 96 . . .	Cic. De Sen. vi. 19 *fin.*
a.	——	xxvii. l. 110 (p. 150) .	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 12 (1120 *a.* 24).
a.	——	xxvii. l. 111 (p. 260) .	Cic. De Off. I. xiv. 42.
a.	——	xxvii. ll. 135 *seqq.* (p. 270)	Cic. De Off. I. xiv. 43.
a.	——	xxvii. l. 151	Cic. De Sen. xiv. 46 *init.*
a.	——	xxvii. ll. 157 *seqq.* . .	Ovid Met. vii. 490 *seqq.*
a.	——	xxvii. l. 164	Ovid Met. vii. 614 *seqq.*
a.	——	xxvii. l. 169	Ovid Met. vii. 652, 653.
a.	——	xxvii. ll. 173 *seqq.* (p. 219)	Ovid Met. vii. 507–511.
a.	——	xxvii. l. 184[3]	Ovid Met. vii. 520–662.
a.	——	xxvii. l. 192	Ovid Met. vii. 475, 476.
a.	——	xxviii. l. 14	Cic. De Sen. xix. 71 *fin.*
c.	——	xxviii. l. 28	Cic. De Sen. xix. 71 *med.*
a.	——	xxviii. l. 31	Ar. Juv. et Sen. xvii. (479 *a.* 20).
a.	——	xxviii. l. 44 (p. 271). .	Cic. De Sen. xxiii. 83.
c.	——	xxviii. l. 51	Cic. De Sen. xxiii. 84 *med.*
b.	——	xxviii. l. 74	Prov. xxiii. 26.
a.	——	xxviii. ll. 75 *seqq.* . .	Rom. ii. 28, 29.
a.	——	xxviii. ll. 97–119 (p. 232)	Luc. Phars. ii. 338–345.
c.	——	xxviii. ll. 121 *seqq.* (p. 304)	Seneca Controv. I. (*sub init.*).
c.	——	xxviii. l. 122 (p. 232) .	Luc. Phars. ix. 554, 555.
a.	——	xxviii. l. 142 (p. 241) .	Luc. Phars. ii. 341.
a.	——	xxix. ll. 37 *seqq.* . . .	Juv. Sat. viii. 6 *seqq.*
c.	——	xxix. ll. 70 *seqq.* . . .	Boeth. Cons. III. Pros. vi. (*ad fin.*).
a.	——	xxix. l. 72 (p. 273) . .	Cic. (?).
a.	——	xxx. l. 38	Matt. vii. 6.

[1] This seems to be the passage chiefly referred to. [2] See note 1, p. 343.

[3] 'Dice e ritrae per *lungo sermone*,' &c. Comp. Ovid, *l. c.* ll. 661, 2.

a. Convito IV. xxx. l. 40 . . . . . Aesop. Fab. i.
c. —— xxx. l. 66 (p. 56) . . Wisd. viii. 3 [1].

De Monarchia.

a. De Monarchia I. i. l. 10 . . . . Ps. i. 3.
b. —— i. l. 15 . . . . Matt. xxv. 25.
c. —— i. l. 34 . . . . 1 Cor. ix. 24 [2].
a. —— i. l. 38 . . . . James i. 5.
a. —— iii. l. 3 . . . . Ar. Eth. I. vii. 21 (1098 *b.* 7).
b. —— iii. l. 22 . . . . Ar. De Coelo I. iv. *fin.* (271 *a.* 33).
b. —— iii. ll. 33–36 . . . Ar. Pol. I. ii. 5–8 (1252 *b.* 13 *seqq.*).
c. —— iii. ll. 45–55 . . . Ar. Eth. I. vii. 12 (1097 *b.* 33 *seqq.*).
a. —— iii. l. 91 . . . . Ar. Pol. I. ii. 2 (1252 *a.* 31).
a. —— iv. l. 14 . . . . Ps. viii. 6.
a. —— iv. l. 23 . . . . Luke ii. 13, 14.
a. —— v. l. 14 . . . . Ar. Pol. I. v. 3 (1254 *a.* 28).
a. —— v. l. 33 . . . . Ar. Pol. I. ii. 6 (1252 *b.* 20, 21).
a. —— v. l. 34 . . . . Homer, Od. ix. 114.
a. —— v. l. 60 . . . . Luke xi. 17.
a. —— viii. l. 10 . . . . Gen. i. 26.
c. —— viii. ll. 17–19 . . Ar. Eth. X. viii. 13 (1179 *a.* 23 *seqq.*)
a. —— viii. l. 23 . . . . Deut. vi. 4.
a. —— ix. l. 6 (p. 141) . . Ar. Phys. II. ii. *fin.* (194 *b.* 13) [3].
a. —— ix. l. 25 . . . . Boeth. Cons. II. Metr. viii. ll. 28–30.
b. —— x. l. 4 (p. 99) . . Ar. De An. III. ix. (432 *b.* 21) [4].
a. —— x. l. 30 (p. 165) . Homer [Il. ii. 204] [5].
a. —— x. ll. 28–31 . . . Ar. Metaph. Λ. x. *fin.* (1076 *a.* 4).
a. —— xi. l. 6 . . . . Virg. Ecl. iv. 6.
b. —— xi. ll. 48, 49 . . . Ar. Eth. V. i. 15, 17, 20 (1129 *b.* 26; 1130 *a.* 3, 4, 13).
a. —— xi. l. 70 . . . . Ar. Eth. V. ii. 5 (1130 *a.* 31).
a. —— xi. l. 75 . . . . Ar. Rhet. I. i. 7 (1354 *a.* 31–34).
c. —— xi. l. 83 . . . . Virg. Aen. i. 287.
a. —— xi. l. 132 . . . . De Causis, Lect. I. (p. 469, B, C).
c. —— xii. l. 15 (p. 119) . Ar. Anal. Pr. II. xxi. (67 *a.* 15) [6].
a. —— xii. ll. 49–52 . . Ar. Metaph. A. ii. (982 *b.* 25–27).
b. —— xii. ll. 55–63 . . Ar. Pol. III. vii. 2–5 (1279 *a.* 25 *seqq.*).
a. —— xii. l. 68 . . . . Ar. Pol. III. iv. 3, 4 (1276 *b.* 30 *seqq.*)
a. —— xii. ll. 77 *seqq.* . . Ar. Pol. IV. i. 9 (1289 *a.* 13–5).
a. —— xiii. l. 15 . . . . Ar. Metaph. Θ. viii. (1049 *b.* 24).
b. —— xiii. l. 23 . . . . Gen. xxvii. 22.
a. —— xiii. l. 26 . . . . Ar. Eth. X. i. 3 (1172 *a.* 34, 35).
a. —— xiii. l. 30 . . . . Ps. xlix. 16.
a. —— xiii. l. 45 (p. 297) . Galen. De Cogn. . . . morbis c. x.

[1] Comp. also Wisdom ix. 9. [2] Comp. Phil. iii. 14. [3] Comp. Metaph. Λ. v. (1071 *a.* 15). [4] And often elsewhere. [5] Quoted as Aristotle. [6] And in about twenty other places in Aristotle.

a.	De Monarchia I.	xiii. l. 61	Ps. lxxi. 2.
b.	——	xiv. ll. 1, 15, 21 (p. 116)	Ar. Part. Anim. iii. 4 (665 *b.* 14, 15)
b.	——	xiv. l. 12	Ar. De Coelo I. iv. (271 *a.* 33)[1].
c.	——	xiv. l. 12	Ar. De Gen. Anim. II. vi. (744 *a.* 36).
a.	——	xiv. l. 37	Ar. Eth. V. x. 6 (1137 *b.* 26).
a.	——	xiv. ll. 65 *seqq.* . .	Exod. xviii. 17 *seqq.*
b.	——	xv. l. 3	Ar. Categ. xii. *init.* (14 *a.* 26 *seqq.*; *b.* 10 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xv. l. 18	Ar. Metaph. A. v. (986 *a.* 24).
a.	——	xv. l. 22 (p. 68) .	Ps. iv. 8.
b.	——	xv. ll. 38–40 . . .	Ar. Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20)[2].
a.	——	xv. l. 72	Ar. Eth. X. ix. 8 (1179 *b.* 31 *seqq.*).
b.	——	xvi. ll. 3 *seqq.* (p. 279)	Oros. Adv. Pag. VI. xxii. 5 *seqq.*
a.	——	xvi. l. 16	Luke ii. 1, 14 (?).
a.	——	xvi. l. 18	Gal. iv. 4.
b.	——	xvi. l. 23	John xix. 23.
a.	——	xvi. l. 36	Ps. cxxxii. 1.
a.	——	II. i. ll. 1–6	Ps. ii. 1–3.
c.	——	ii. l. 11	Ar. Gen. Anim. V. viii. (789 *b.* 7).
a.	——	ii. l. 42 (p. 68) .	John i. 3, 4.
a.	——	ii. l. 63	Ar. Eth. I. iii. 4 (1094 *b.* 24, 25); *or* I. vii. 18 (1098 *a.* 26).
a.	——	ii. l. 72	Rom. i. 20.
b.	——	iii. l. 10	Ar. Eth. IV. iii. 15 (1123 *b.* 35).
a.	——	iii. l. 16	Ar. Pol. IV. viii. 9 (1294 *a.* 21).
a.	——	iii. l. 18 (pp. 256, 304)	Juv. Sat. viii. 20.
a.	——	iii. l. 24	Matt. vii. 2.
a.	——	iii. ll. 32–35 . .	Liv. I. i.
b.	——	iii. l. 42 (p. 193) .	Virg. Aen. i. 342.
a.	——	iii. l. 46	Virg. Aen. i. 544.
a.	——	iii. l. 52	Virg. Aen. vi. 170.
a.	——	iii. l. 55 (p. 11) .	Homer, Il. xxiv. 259.
a.	——	iii. l. 65	Virg. Aen. iii. 1.
a.	——	iii. ll. 73 *seqq.* . .	Virg. Aen. viii. 134–137.
a.	——	iii. ll. 80 *seqq.* . .	Virg. Aen. iii. 163–167.
a.	——	iii. l. 87	Oros. Adv. Pag. I. ii. 11.
a.	——	iii. ll. 100, 101 (p. 193)	Virg. Aen. iii. 339, 340.
a.	——	iii. ll. 106, 107 .	Virg. Aen. iv. 171, 172.
a.	——	iii. ll. 114, 116 .	Virg. Aen. xii. 936, 937.
a.	——	iv. ll. 11–14 . .	Exod. viii. 18, 19.
a.	——	iv. ll. 34 *seqq.* . .	Luc. Phars. ix. 477–480.
a.	——	iv. l. 33	Livy I. xx.
a.	——	iv. l. 48 (p. 275) .	Livy V. xlvii.
a.	——	iv. ll. 53 *seqq.* . .	Virg. Aen. viii. 652–656.
a.	——	iv. l. 63	Livy XXVI. xi.
c.	——	iv. ll. 65 *seqq.* . .	Livy II. xiii.[3]

[1] And very many other places. [2] And often elsewhere.

[3] Perhaps Orosius II. v. 3.

a.	De Monarchia II.	v. l. 16	Cic. De Invent. I. xxxviii. 68.
a.	——	v. l. 24	Sen. (Pseudo) De IV Virtt. c. 4.
a.	——	v. l. 55	Cic. De Off. II. viii. 26, 27.
a.	——	v. l. 76 (p. 276) . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. II. xii. 8 (?) [1].
a.	——	v. ll. 76 *seqq.* (p. 276)	Livy III. xxvi, xxix.
a.	——	v. l. 84	Cic. De Fin. II. iv. 12.
a.	——	v. l. 98 (p. 187) .	Virg. Aen. vi. 844, 845.
a.	——	v. l. 102 (p. 276) .	Livy V. xxxii. & xliii.
a.	——	v. l. 111	Virg. Aen. vi. 826.
a.	——	v. l. 114	Livy II. v.
a.	——	v. ll. 119, 120 . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 821, 822.
a.	——	v. l. 126	Livy II. xii.
a.	——	v. l. 130	Livy VIII. ix. ; X. xxviii.
a.	——	v. l. 141	Cic. De Fin. II. xix. 61.
a.	——	v. l. 158	Cic. De Off. I. xxxi. 112.
a.	——	vi. ll. 46–49 . .	Ar. Eth. VI. ix. 5 (1142 *b.* 22–4).
a.	——	vii. l. 40	Ar. Phys. II. ii. (194 *a.* 28).
a.	——	vii. ll. 52 *seqq.* .	Ar. Pol. I. v. 11 (1255 *a.* 1, 2).
a.	——	vii. ll. 71 *seqq.* . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 848–854.
a.	——	vii. ll. 82 *seqq.* .	Virg. Aen. iv. 227–230.
a.	——	viii. l. 14 . . .	Ar. Pol. I. ii. 14 (1253 *a.* 25) (?).
a.	——	viii. l. 17 . . .	Ar. Eth. I. ii. 8 (1094 *b.* 8–10).
a.	——	viii. l. 36 . . .	Heb. xi. 6.
a.	——	viii. l. 37 . . .	Lev. xvii. 3, 4.
a.	——	viii. l. 43 . . .	John x. 7, 9.
a.	——	viii. l. 56 . . .	1 Sam. xv. 10, 11.
a.	——	viii. l. 57 . . .	Exod. vii. 9.
a.	——	viii. l. 61 . . .	2 Chron. xx. 12.
a.	——	viii. l. 70 . . .	Acts i. 23–26.
a.	——	viii. l. 80 (p. 233) .	Luc. Phars. iv. 609 *seqq.*
a.	——	viii. l. 82 . . .	Ovid Met. ix. 183.
a.	——	viii. l. 84 . . .	Ovid Met. x. 560 *seqq.*
a.	——	viii. l. 92 . . .	Virg. Aen. v. 337, 338.
a.	——	viii. l. 95 . . .	Cic. De Off. III. x. 42.
a.	——	ix. l. 25 (p. 281) .	Oros. Adv. Pag. I. iv. 1, 4.
a.	——	ix. l. 30	Ovid Met. iv. 58.
a.	——	ix. l. 34	Ovid Met. iv. 88.
a.	——	ix. ll. 35 *seqq.* . .	Oros. Adv. Pag. I. xiv. 1–3.
b.	——	ix. l. 40	Ar. Eth. I. iv. 5 (1095 *b.* 1).
a.	——	ix. l. 55 (p. 232) .	Luc. Phars. ii. 672 *seqq.*
a.	——	ix. l. 66 (p. 278) .	[Livy [2]].
a.	——	ix. ll. 67 *seqq.* (p. 233)	Luc. Phars. viii. 692–694.
a.	——	ix. l. 75	Rom. xi. 33.
a.	——	ix. ll. 83–86 . .	Virg. Aen. i. 234–236.
a.	——	ix. ll. 87 *seqq.* . .	Luc. Phars. i. 109–111.
a.	——	ix. ll. 91 *seqq.* . .	Boeth. II. Metr. vi. ll. 8–13.
a.	——	ix. l. 101 . . .	Luke ii. 1.
a.	——	x. l. 10	Ps. x. 8.

[1] See note on Livy III. xxvi–xxix. (p. 355).

[2] A statement wrongly attributed to Livy.

a.	De Monarchia II.	x. l. 22 (p. 297) .	Vegetius De Re Militari iii. 9.
a.	——	x. l. 22	Cic. De Off. I. xi. 34.
a.	——	x. l. 37 (p. 272).	Cic. De Off. I. xii. 38.
a.	——	x. l. 46	Matt. xviii. 20.
a.	——	x.ll.62 *seqq.*(p.259)	Cic. De Off. I. xii. 38[1].
a.	——	xi. ll. 15 *seqq.* .	Virg. Aen. xii. 940 *seqq.*
a.	——	xi. l. 37 . . .	Livy I. xxiv, xxv; & Oros. Adv. Pag. II. iv. 9.
a.	——	xi.ll.44 *seqq.*(p.242)	Luc. Phars. ii. 135–138.
a.	——	xi. l. 69. . . .	2 Tim. iv. 8.
b.	——	xii. l. 1	Ps. ii. 1.
a.	——	xii. l. 39 . . .	Ar. Eth. X. i. 3 (1172 *a.* 34, 35).
a.	——	xii. l. 42 . . .	Luke ii. 1.
a.	——	xiii. l. 8 . . .	Rom. v. 12.
a.	——	xiii. ll. 16 *seqq.* .	Eph. i. 5–8.
a.	——	xiii. l. 26 . . .	John xix. 30.
a.	——	xiii. l. 36 . . .	Exod. ii. 14.
a.	——	xiii. l. 44 . . .	Is. liii. 4.
b.	——	xiii. l. 51 . . .	John xi. 49–52.
a.	——	xiii. ll. 50 *seqq.* .	Luke xxiii. 11.
a.	——	III. i. l. 1	Dan. vi. 22.
a.	——	i. l. 15	Prov. viii. 7.
a.	——	i. ll. 17, 18 . .	Ar. Eth. I. vi. 1 (1096 *a.* 15).
a.	——	i. l. 22	1 Thess. v. 8.
a.	——	i. l. 24	Is. vi. 6, 7.
b.	——	i. l. 26	Col. i. 13, 14.
a.	——	i. l. 31	Ps. cxi. 7.
b.	——	ii. l. 17	Ar. Anal. Pr. II. ii. (53 *b.* 6, 25).
b.	——	iii. l. 13 (p. 106).	Ar. Eth. III. iii. 6 (1112 *a.* 28).
b.	——	iii. l. 47 . . .	John viii. 44.
b.	——	iii. l. 68 . . .	Rom. viii. 17.
a.	——	iii. l. 76 . . .	Ps. cx. 9.
a.	——	iii. l. 79 . . .	Cant. i. 3.
a.	——	iii. l. 84 . . .	Matt. xxviii. 20.
a.	——	iii. ll. 99 *seqq.* .	Matt. xv. 2, 3.
c.	——	iii. ll. 122–124 .	Phys. I. ii. (185 *a.* 1–3).
c.	——	iv. l. 4	Ar. Metaph. A. i. 981 *a.* 30; *b.* 31).
a.	——	iv. l. 10. . . .	Gen. i. 16.
a.	——	iv. l. 25. . . .	Ar. Soph. Elenc. xviii. (176 *b.* 29).
a.	——	iv. ll. 30–3 (p. 117)	Ar. Phys. I. iii. *init.* (186 *a.* 7).
a.	——	iv. ll. 52 *seqq.* .	S. Aug. De Civ. Dei XVI. ii. *ad fin.*
a.	——	iv. l. 63 (p. 291).	S. Aug. Doct. Christ. I. xxxvi. *ad fin.*
a.	——	iv. l. 70. . . .	S. Aug. Doct. Christ. I. xxxvii. *med.*
a.	——	v. ll. 8, 9 . . .	Gen. xxix. 34, 35.
a.	——	vi. l. 4	1 Sam. xv. 16, 23, 28.
c.	——	vi. l. 35. . . .	Ar. Gen. Anim. v. 8 (789 *b.* 10–12).
b.	——	vi. l. 52 . . .	Ar. Eth. VI. ii. 6 (1139 *b.* 11)[2].

[1] The lines quoted from Ennius.

[2] Agathon being quoted evidently from Aristotle's citation.

a.	De Monarchia III.	vii. l. 1	Matt. ii. 11.
a.	——	vii. ll. 17–20 . .	Ar. Anal. Pr. i. 25 (41 *b.* 36) (?).
b.	——	vii. l. 30 . . .	Ar. Eth. II. i. 2 (1103 *a.* 20)[1].
a.	——	viii. ll. 2 & 41 .	Matt. xvi. 19.
a.	——	viii. ll. 2–8 . .	Matt. xviii. 18, & John xx. 23.
c.	——	viii. ll. 45, 46 .	Rom. vii. 3.
a.	——	ix. l. 2	Luke xxii. 38.
a.	——	ix. l. 25 . . .	Luke xxii. 7.
a.	——	ix. l. 33 . . .	Luke xxii. 14.
a.	——	ix. l. 36 . . .	Luke xxii. 35, 36.
a.	——	ix. l. 60 . . .	Luke xxii. 38.
a.	——	ix. ll. 70 *seqq.* .	Matt. xvi. 15, 16, 21, 23.
a.	——	ix. l. 84 . . .	Matt. xvii. 4.
a.	——	ix. l. 90 . . .	Matt. xiv. 28.
a.	——	ix. l. 94 . . .	Matt. xxvi. 33, 35.
a.	——	ix. l. 98 . . .	Mark xiv. 29.
a.	——	ix. l. 101 . . .	Luke xxii. 33.
a.	——	ix. ll. 103 *seqq.* .	John xiii. 6, 8.
a.	——	ix. l. 108 . . .	John xviii. 10, & ‖ s.
a.	——	ix. l. 111 . . .	John xx. 5, 6.
a.	——	ix. l. 115 . . .	John xxi. 7.
a.	——	ix. l. 120 . . .	John xxi. 21.
a.	——	ix. l. 132 . . .	Matt. x. 34, 35.
a.	——	ix. l. 138 . . .	Acts I. 1.
a.	——	x. ll. 44–46 . .	John xix. 23, 24, 34.
a.	——	x. l. 50	1 Cor. iii. 11.
a.	——	x. l. 53	Matt. xvi. 18.
a.	——	x. l. 59	Cant. viii. 5.
a.	——	x. l. 100 . . .	Ar. Eth. IV. i. 8 (1120 *a.* 14).
a.	——	x. l. 109 . . .	Matt. x. 9.
a.	——	x. l. 112 . . .	Luke x. 4 (*or* ix. 3).
a.	——	xii. l. 2	Ar. Metaph. I. i. (1052 *b.* 34).
a.	——	xii. ll. 62–67 . .	Ar. Eth. X. v. 10 (1176 *a.* 16).
a.	——	xiii. l. 43 . . .	Acts xxv. 10.
a.	——	xiii. l. 46 . . .	Acts xxvii. 24.
a.	——	xiii. l. 49 . . .	Acts xxviii. 19.
a.	——	xiii. l. 57 . . .	Phil. i. 23.
a.	——	xiii. l. 66 . . .	Lev. ii. 11.
a.	——	xiii. l. 74 . . .	Lev. xi. 43.
a.	——	xiv. l. 22 . . .	Matt. xvi. 18.
a.	——	xiv. l. 23 . . .	John xvii. 4.
a.	——	xiv. l. 33 . . .	Numb. xviii. 20.
a.	——	xiv. l. 46 . . .	Ar. Metaph. Θ. viii. (1049 *b.* 24).
c.	——	xv. l. 1	Ar. Phys. VII. iii. (246 *a.* 13–15).
a.	——	xv. l. 11 . . .	Ar. Phys. II. i. (193 *b.* 6 *seqq.*).
a.	——	xv. l. 20 . . .	John xiii. 15.
a.	——	xv. ll. 24–26 . .	John xxi. 19.
a.	——	xv. l. 28 . . .	John xviii. 36.

[1] And often elsewhere.

a.	De Monarchia III.	xv. l. 36 . . .	Ps. xciv. 5.
a.	——	xv. ll. 56–59 (p. 119)	Ar. Categ. xii. (14 *b.* 18–22).
b.	——	xvi. l. 17 . . .	De Causis, Lect. II. (p. 472 B.).
a.	——	xvi. l. 26 . . .	Ar. De An. II. ii. (413 *b.* 26).
c.	——	xvi. l. 32 . . .	Ar. De Part. Anim. III. i. (661 *b.* 10).
a.	——	xvi. l. 74 (p. 59) .	Ps. xxxi. 9.

De Vulgari Eloquio.

b.	De Vulgari Eloquio	I. ii. l. 8 . . .	Ar. Pol. I. ii. 10[1].
b.	——	ii. l. 43 . .	Gen. iii. 1–5.
b.	——	ii. l. 45 . .	Numb. xxii. 28 *seqq.*
a.	——	ii. l. 53 . .	Ovid Met. v. 294–9, 677, 8.
a.	——	iv. l. 13 . .	Gen. iii. 2, 3.
b.	——	vi. l. 52 . .	Gen. xi. 9.
b.	——	vi. l. 54 . .	Gen. x. 21.
b.	——	vii. ll. 28–31 .	Gen. xi. 2, 4, 9.
a.	——	x. l. 46 (p. 241)	Luc. Phars. ii. 396–438.
b.	——	xii. l. 35 . .	Matt. v. 22.
b.	——	II. i. ll. 80, 81 (p. 198)	Hor. Epist. I. xiv. l. 43.
a.	——	iv. l. 35 . .	Hor. A. P. l. 38.
b.	——	iv. l. 70 . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 129.
a.	——	iv. l. 73 . .	Virg. Aen. vi. 129–131.
a.	——	viii. l. 23 . .	Virg. Aen. i. 1.
a.	——	x. ll. 6–9 . .	Ar. Phys. I. i. (184 *a.* 12–14).

Epistolae.

b.	Epistola	i. 2. ll. 40 *seqq.*	Virg. Aen. i. 600–605.
b.	——	i. 2. ll. 42–44	Virg. Aen. ii. 536, 537.
c.	——	iv. l. 1	Ps. xliv. 2.
b.	——	iv. 2. l. 23	Ar. Gen. et Cor. I. iii. (319 *a.* 21).
a.	——	iv. 4. l. 40	Ovid Met. iv. 1 *seqq.*, 389, 425 *seqq.*
a.	——	iv. 4. l. 49	Ovid Met. iv. 192, 241.
c.	——	iv. 5. l. 51	Ovid Met. xiv. 694[2] (?).
a.	——	iv. 5. l. 53 (p. 290) . . .	Sen. (Pseudo) Fort. Remedia.
a.	——	iv. 5. l. 56	John xv. 19.
b.	——	v. 1. l. 1	2 Cor. vi. 2.
b.	——	v. 1. l. 13	Matt. v. 6.
b.	——	v. 1. l. 17	Rev. v. 5.
b.	——	v. 2. l. 33	Matt. xxi. 41.
c.	——	v. 4. l. 60	Virg. Georg. i. 412.
a.	——	v. 4. l. 62	Ps. xciv. 2.
a.	——	v. 4. l. 64	Rom. xiii. 2.
a.	——	v. 4. l. 68	Acts ix. 5.
a.	——	v. 5. l. 70	Luke xxi. 28.
c.	——	v. 7. l. 112.	1 Kings xxii. 17

[1] And often elsewhere.

[2] Comp. Trist. V. viii. ll. 7–9.

a.	Epistola	v. 7. l. 114.	Ps. xciv. 5.
a.	——	v. 8. l. 120.	Rom. i. 20.
c.	——	v. 8. ll. 127 *seqq.* . . .	Virg. Aen. i. 372, 373.
a.	——	v. 9. l. 153.	Matt. xxii. 21.
a.	——	v. 10. ll. 157, 158 . . .	John xix. 10, 11.
a.	——	v. 10. l. 160	Eph. iv. 17.
a.	——	v. 10. l. 165	1 Pet. ii. 17.
a.	——	vi. 1. l. 22.	Deut. xxxii. 35[1].
c.	——	vi. 2. l. 29.	Rev. xxi. 8.
b.	——	vi. 3. l. 68	2 Sam. i. 21.
b.	——	vi. 4. l. 104 (p. 179) . .	Virg.Aen.x.58(*or*iv.344; vii.322).
c.	——	vi. 4. l. 115	Virg. Aen. x. 843.
b.	——	vi. 5. l. 128	Virg. Aen. vi. 276.
a.	——	vi. 5. l. 130	Virg. Aen. ii. 353.
b.	——	vi. 5. l. 144	Prov. i. 17.
b.	——	vi. 5. l. 146	Ps. cxviii. 1.
b.	——	vi. 5. l. 154	Rom. vii. 23.
a.	——	vi. 6. l. 187	Is. liii. 4.
c.	——	vii. 1. l. 2	John xiv. 27.
b.	——	vii. 1. l. 10	Ps. cxxxvi. 1.
a.	——	vii. 1. l. 22	Virg. Ecl. iv. 6.
a.	——	vii. 2. l. 28	Josh. x. 12, 13.
a.	——	vii. 2. l. 28	2 Kings xx. 11[2].
a.	——	vii. 2. l. 31.	Luke vii. 19.
b.	——	vii. 2. l. 44.	Luke i. 47.
a.	——	vii. 2. l. 45.	John i. 29.
b.	——	vii. 3. l. 47.	Virg. Aen. ii. 373, 374.
a.	——	vii. 3. ll. 62, 63	Virg. Aen. i. 286, 287.
a.	——	vii. 3. l. 64.	Luke ii. 1.
b.	——	vii. 3. ll. 64 *seqq.* (p. 279) .	Oros. Adv. Pag. VI. xxii. 5 *seqq.*
c.	——	vii. 3. l. 68.	John iii. 16, 18.
a.	——	vii. 3. l. 73.	Matt. iii. 15.
a.	——	vii. 4. ll. 81 *seqq.* (p. 228) .	Luc. Phars. I. 280–282.
a.	——	vii. 4. ll. 88 *seqq.*. . . .	Virg. Aen. iv. 272–276.
a.	——	vii. 5. ll. 102 *seqq.* . . .	1 Sam. xv. 17, 18.
b.	——	vii. 7. ll. 146, 147 . . .	Ovid Met. x. 298 *seqq.*
b.	——	vii. 7. ll. 148 *seqq.* . . .	Virg. Aen. xii. 595–603.
b.	——	vii. 7. l. 156	Gen. i. 26.
b.	——	vii. 7. l. 165	Rom. xiii. 2.
b.	——	vii. 7. l. 172	Rom. i. 28.
b.	——	vii. ll. 178 *seqq.*	1 Sam. xvii. 49, 50.
b.	——	vii. 8. l. 187	Ps. cxxxvi. 1 *seqq.*
a.	——	viii. 1. l. 1	Lam. i. 1.
a.	——	viii. 2. l. 20	John xxi. 15–17.
b.	——	viii. 3. l. 34	Lam. i. 7.
a.	——	viii. 3. l. 35	Ps. cxiii. 2 (*bis*) *or* lxxviii. 10.
a.	——	viii. 4. l. 53	Ezek. viii. 16.

[1] Or Rom. xii. 19; Heb. x. 30.

[2] For 'filius Amos' see verse 1.

b.	Epistola viii. 4. l. 55		Lev. x. 1.
b.	—— viii. 4. ll. 56 *seqq.* . . .		John ii. 14, 15.
b.	—— viii. 4. l. 65		1 Macc. vii. 4–12.
b.	—— viii. 4. ll. 67–69		2 Sam. vi. 6, 7.
a.	—— viii. 5. ll. 74, 75		1 Cor. xv. 10.
a.	—— viii. 5. l. 75		Ps. lxviii. 10.
b.	—— viii. 5. l. 76		Ps. viii. 3.
b.	—— viii. 5. l. 78		John ix. 17 *seqq.*
a.	—— viii. 5. l. 84		Ar. Eth. I. vi. 1 (1096 *a.* 15).
b.	—— viii. 5. ll. 90, 91		Matt. viii. 24–26[1].
b.	—— viii. 7. l. 108		John iii. 5.
b.	—— viii. 7. l. 110		Prov. xxx. 15.
b.	—— viii. 8. l. 129		Numb. xxii. 28.
b.	—— viii. 9. l. 133		2 Cor. xii. 11.
b.	—— viii. 11. l. 186		Luke xix. 38.
b.	—— x. 1. ll. 10, 13 *seqq.* . . .		1 Kings x. 1, 7.
b.	—— x. 1. l. 11		Ovid Met. v. 250 *seqq.*
c.	—— x. 2. ll. 25–28		Ar. Eth. VIII. viii. 5, 6 (1159 *b.* 2–14).
b.	—— x. 2. ll. 25 *seqq.*		Ar. Eth. VIII. ii. 1 (1155 *b.* 19), & iii. 1 (1156 *a.* 10–16).
b.	—— x. 2. l. 32		Ar. Eth. VIII. vi. 6 (1158 *a.* 34, 5).
a.	—— x. 2. l. 40		Wisd. vii. 14.
b.	—— x. 2. l. 44		Ar. De An. III. iii. (428 *b.* 3).
c.	—— x. 2. l. 50 (p. 150) . . .		Ar. Pol. I. ii. 2 (1252 *a.* 31).
a.	—— x. 3. l. 62		Ar. Eth. IX. i. 1 (1163 *b.* 32).
a.	—— x. 5. l. 91		Ar. Metaph. A. *min.* i. (993 *b.* 30).
a.	—— x. 7. l. 142		Ps. cxiii. 1.
a.	—— x. 10. ll. 212 *seqq.* . . .		Hor. A. P. 93–95.
a.	—— x. 10. *fin.* l. 228		Hor. A. P. 75–78.
b.	—— x. 16. l. 274		Ar. Eth. I. iii. 6 (1095 *a.* 5).
a.	—— x. 16. l. 279		Ar. Metaph. A. *min.* i. (993 *b.* 22).
a.	—— x. 18. l. 296		Rhet. III. xiv. 1 (1414 *b.* 19).
b.	—— x. 18. l. 304		Ar. Rhet. III. xiv. 6 (1415 *a.* 12).
a.	—— x. 19. l. 320		Cic. De Invent. I. xv. 20.
a.	—— x. 20. l. 371		Ar. Metaph. A. *min.* ii. (994 *a.* 1 *seqq.*).
a.	—— x. 20. l. 380		De Causis, Lect. I. *init.* (p. 469 A).
a.	—— x. 21. l. 407		De Causis, Lect. X. *init.* (p. 488 D).
a.	—— x. 22. l. 414		Jer. xxiii. 24.
a.	—— x. 22. l. 416		Ps. cxxxviii. 7–9.
a.	—— x. 22. l. 420		Wisd. i. 7.
a.	—— x. 22. l. 422		Ecclus. xlii. 16.
a.	—— x. 22. l. 425		Luc. Phars. ix. 580.
a.	—— x. 25. l. 460		Ar. Phys. IV. iv. (211 *b.* 10 *seqq.*).
c.	—— x. 26. l. 504 (p. 151) . .		Ar. Part. Anim. III. x. (673 *a.* 8).
a.	—— x. 27. l. 511		Ar. De Coelo I. ii. *fin.* (269 *b.* 16).
a.	—— x. 27. l. 517		Eph. iv. 10.
a.	—— x. 27. l. 521		Ezek. xxviii. 12, 13.

[1] Or || in Mark and Luke.

a.	Epistola x. 28. ll. 540 *seqq.* . . .	2 Cor. xii. 3, 4.
a.	—— x. 28. l. 549	Matt. xvii. 6.
a.	—— x. 28. l. 551	Ezek. ii. 1.
a.	—— x. 28. l. 560	Dan. ii. 3.
a.	—— x. 28. l. 563	Matt. v. 45.
a.	—— x. 29. l. 578	Plato . . . . (?)
a.	—— x. 33. l. 615	John xvii. 3.
a.	—— x. 33. l. 617	Boeth. Cons. III. Metr. ix. l. 27.
a.	—— x. 33. l. 625	Rev. i. 8.

Quaestio de Aqua et Terra.

a.	Quaest. ii. l. 5	Ar. Categ. viii. (10 *a.* 11).
b.	—— iv. *init.*; xxiii. l. 14 (p. 128)	Ar. De Coelo II. xiii. (293 *a.* 30).
a.	—— vi. l. 12	Ar. Meteor. II. ii. *fin.* (356 *a.* 33, *b.* 1).
a.	—— xi. l. 11	Ar. Phys. I. ii. (185 *a.* 1–3).
a.	—— xi. l. 14	Ar. Eth. I. vii. 21 (1098 *b.* 3).
a.	—— xii. l. 44	Ar. De Coelo IV. i. (307 *b.* 31).
a.	—— xii. l. 56	Ar. Categ. i. *init.* (1 *a.* 1–4).
b.	—— xiii. ll. 12–30 (p. 128) . .	Ar. De Coelo II. iv. (287 *b.* 4–14).
b.	—— xiii. l. 35 (p. 116)	Ar. Part. Anim. III. iv. (665 *b.* 14, 15).
a.	—— xiii. l. 41	Ar. De Coelo I. iv. (271 *a.* 33)[1].
a.	—— xiii. l. 42	Ar. Gen. Anim. II. vi. (744 *a.* 36)[2].
b.	—— xvi. ll. 51–55	Ar. De Coelo II. xiv. (296 *b.* 9–18).
a.	—— xviii. l. 68	Ar. Eth. I. xiii. 15–17 (1102 *b.* 13 *seqq.*).
a.	—— xix. ll. 18–20	Ar. Anal. Pr. I. xli. (49 *b.* 34 *seqq.*).
a.	—— xix. l. 43	Oros. Adv. Pag. I. ii. 7, 13.
c.	—— xx. ll. 4–6	Ar. Anal. Post. II. vii. (93 *a.* 20).
a.	—— xx. l. 16	Ar. Eth. I. iii. 4 (1094 *b.* 23–25).
a.	—— xx. l. 23	Ar. Phys. I. i. (184 *a.* 16 *seqq.*).
c.	—— xx. ll. 25–28.	Ar. Metaph. H. iv. (1044 *b.* 10–15).
b.	—— xx. l. 28	Ar. Metaph. A. ii. (982 *b.* 12).
b.	—— xx. ll. 39–54 (pp. 124, 300) .	Ar. De Mundo iii. (392 *b.* 35 *seqq.*).
c.	—— xxi. ll. 44–46 (p. 128) . .	Ar. Meteor. II. viii. (366 *b.* 15 to 367 *a.* 4).
a.	—— xxi. l. 55	Ar. De Coelo II. v. (287 *b.* 26–31).
a.	—— xxi. l. 31	Ptolemy . . . . (?)
a.	—— xxi. l. 69	Gen. i. 9.
b.	—— xxii. l. 3 (p. 106)	Ar. Eth. X. vii. 8 (1177 *b.* 31 *seqq.*).
a.	—— xxii. l. 6	Job xi. 7.
a.	—— xxii. l. 9	Ps. cxxxviii. 6.
a.	—— xxii. l. 11	Is. lv. 9.
a.	—— xxii. l. 15.	Rom. xi. 33.
a.	—— xxii. l. 20.	John viii. 21.
a.	—— xxiii. l. 47	Ar. Meteor. I. ix. (346 *b.* 23–31).

[1] And elsewhere. [2] Also elsewhere in B. II.

GENERAL INDEX

[*Note.*—References to authors and passages included in the two preceding Indexes are not repeated here.]

Academy, Letters in the, 29 n, 135, 190, 195 n, 278 n.
Achilles, story of his death, 189.
— spear of, 302.
— and Chiron, 245.
Adolescentulus, as used by Cicero, 84.
Aesop, 5, 16, 294.
Aether, see *s. v.* **Etera.**
Aether and **aer** distinguished, 124, 300.
Agathon, 11, 151.
Age of our Lord at His death, 90 n.
Albertus Magnus, 9, 12, 13, 94, 97, 98, 111, 123, 124 n, 129 n, 130, 140 n, 155, 156, 308, 309, 311, 315 n, 317.
— his *Meteora* (or *de Meteoris*) referred to, 13, 121, 122, 127, 129, 132, 135, 289, 317.
Albumassar, 13, 129, 135, 289.
Alexander Balas, 262.
Alexander the Great, 135, 233, 262, 274, 278.
Alexander of Pherae, 262.
Alfarabius, 311.
Alfraganus, 5, 126 n, 132, 298, 299.
Algazel, 159.
Allegorical treatment of Classical authors, 176 n.
Allegory, over-interpretation of, 291.
Allusive references, 17, 18, 247.
Anacreon, 151.
Antaeus, 215, 233.
Antenor in Virgil and Dante, 190.
Antictona, 128, 267 n, 306.
Antiphon, 151.
ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, 42, 59, 60, 66 n, 76.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 2, 11, 27, 33, 64, 79, 85, 98, 105, 107, 109, 110, 163, 294, 309 *seqq.*
Aquinas, St. Thomas, his lost Commentary on the *Timaeus*, 157.
— a translation of Aristotle promoted by him, 310, 311, 316.
Argomento, as used by Dante, 101.
Argyropylus, 311 n, 313.
Ariosto, 17 n.
Aristotle, D.'s indebtedness to, 94-96, 99.
— D.'s minute knowledge of, 8, 94; except the *Poetics*, 8, 93.
— his authority supreme with D., 9, 92.
— D. differing from, 33, 92, 93.
— the so-called 'New Aristotle,' 307.
— order of translation of his works, 310.
— study of, in thirteenth century, 92.
— compared by D. with Socrates, Academics, &c., 268.
— other references, 78, 87 n, 289 n, &c.
Augustine, St., 5, 7, 11, 52, 68, 69, 73, 74, 75, 159, 163, 164, 171, 176, 188, 189, 192 n, 276 n, 294, 300, 301.
Augustus, Christ a Roman citizen under, 279, 280.
Autentin, 305 n, 306.
Avarice, Dante's contempt for, 31 n.
Averroes, 97, 115, 308, 309, 318 n.
Avicenna, 159, 316.

Babylon, in Assyria and in Egypt, 233.
Bagrada, 234.
Beatrice, 11, 33, 58, 171, 178 n, 218, 284, 285, 286.
Benedict, St., 291.
Benvenuto da Imola, 16, 58 n, 63, 66, 85, 177, 237, 244, 246, 253 n, 262, 294.

Bernard de Ventadour, quoted, 303.
Bernard, St., 7.
Boccaccio, 7 n, 17 n, 29, 102, 108, 176, 179, 228 n, 237, 306.
Boethius, 7, 13, 257, 258, 282.
— canonized in 1884, 282.
— his description of Fortune, 285.
— his personification of Philosophy, 284.
— a translator of some of Aristotle's works, 309, 311 n, 318 n.
— 'il tuo dottore' (?), 283.
Boethius (*al.* Boetius), of Dalmatia (?), translator of Aristotle, 309.
Bonaventura, St., 17, 64, 298.
Branca d'Oria, 23, 81.
Breviary revised by Urban VIII, 39.
Brown, Sir Thomas, quoted, 103.
Browning, 'The Statue and the Bust,' 80.
Brunetto Latini, see *s.v.* Latini.
Buggea (Bougie), 230.
Buhle (Ed. of Aristotle), 309.
Buti, Commentary of, 30, 66, 108, 179.
Butler, Mr. A. J., quoted, 3, 63, 87, 106, 112, 113, 115, 117, 136, 140, 165, 207, 216, 227, 246, 248, 295.
Bywater, Prof., quoted, 311 n.

Cacus, as a centaur, 175.
Caiaphas, 177.
Calderon, 11 n.
Camillus, 277.
Can Grande, epistle to, 7, 164 n, 198.
Capaneus, 249.
Carlyle, Dr., 213.
Cassius, 266.
Castelvetro, 263.
Cato, Dante's treatment of, 170, 171, 231, 232, 304.
— St. Augustine on, 171.
Causis, De, quoted as Aristotle, 97, 98.
Chalcidius, translator of Plato, 8, 156, 157, 158 n, 160, 161.
Chaucer, 6 n, 303.
Cicero, D. indebted to him in Classification of Sins, 10, 259.
— Orations apparently not known to D., 9, 258, 266.
— de Amicitia, 7, 9, 12, 258, 261, 294.
— de Senectute, 9, 189, 258, 272.
— de Officiis, 9, 258, 259, 294.
— de Finibus, 9, 258, 264.
— Orator, 163.
— pseudo-Ciceronian quotation, 273.
Cincinnatus, 276.
Circe, 264.
Classification of Sins in *Inferno*, 10, 95, 259.
Claudian, 240.
'Comento Anonimo' (= Bambaglioli), 29 n.
Comparetti, 176 n.
Complessione, 123.
'Conflate' quotations, 67 n.
Copyists' errors and authors' errors, 35–37, 39–41, 55, 143 n, 146, 147, 153 n.
Cranes, similes from flight of, 240 n.
Creationist theory adopted by Dante, 33.
Cross, Mr. W. J., 108.

Daniello da Lucca, Commentary of, 50, 225, 246.
Dante, his prodigious learning, 1, 3, 8, 298.
— his reverence for Scripture, 47; for Aristotle, 9, 10, 92, 259.
— his minute knowledge of Scripture, 8; of Aristotle, 8, 93, 94; of the *Aeneid*, 8.
— his slight knowledge of the *Georgics*, 9, 193.
— differs from Aristotle, 33, 92, 93; from Virgil, 167 n.
— his ignorance of Hebrew, 60.
— his knowledge or ignorance of Greek, 164, 165, 267, 305 *seqq.*
— considers poetry untranslatable, 10, 306.
— in the Lunigiana, 242.
— his views on parental authority, 91.
— silence as to his wife Gemma, 183 n.
Decretals, 292.
Dictys and Dares, 165, 190, 264 n, 302.
Dido, 172.
'Digest,' 289.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 115.
Dionysius, 'the Tyrant,' 263.
Divina Commedia, MSS. and Commentaries, 34, 35.
Domitian, 32, 245.
Dreams at daybreak, 217.
Duns Scotus, 157.

Earth, motions of, 160, 161.
'Echo' of quotations, 19, 20, 185, 196, 256.
Edd. Milanesi, 140, 149, 191, 221.
Ennius, 12, 259, 293.
Entomata, 306.
Equinoxes, precession of, 126 n.
Erasmus, 6 n.
Erichtho, 235–237.
Esau and Jacob, 65.
Etera, difficulties of reading connected with, 36, 53, 221.
Euphrates and Tigris, 284.

Euridice, 21, 178.
Euripides, 16.

Fabricius, story of, 187–189.
Fay's Concordance, 45.
Febrer, Catalan translation of Div. Com., 108, 312 n.
Florilegia, 10, 12, 14–16, 154, 178, 199, 202, 204, 205, 215, 228 n, 261 n, 295, 296, 297.
Florus, 10, 195, 274, 275, 276, 277.
Fortuitorum Remedia, 290.
Fortune, D.'s description of, copied from Boethius, 285.
Foscolo, 'Discorso,' 185 n, 191.
Francesca and Paolo, 23, 172, 184.
Francis, St., 2, 18, 64, 84, 85, 86, 291.
Fransoni, quoted, 236.
Fraticelli, 149, 153 n, 164 n, 242, 255.
Frederic II, emperor, projected translations of Aristotle, 307.
Frontinus, 7.

Galaxy, theories as to the nature of, 93, 127, 305, 314 *seqq*.
Galen, 'Tegni' (*τέχναι*), 297.
Gautier de Lille, 304.
Generation, Aristotle and Dante's theories of, 136–139.
Genoese voyages of discovery, 264 n.
Geography, mediaeval, 47 n, 225, 229, 279.
Gerardus of Cremona, 316.
Giants, 173, 234, 251 n.
Giuliani, referred to, 37 n, 55, 56, 98, 120, 138, 140, 147, 148, 149, 150, 153 n, 191, 195 n, 196, 254, 306 n, 317.
Goethe, 11 n.
Golden Age, 217.
Gregory IX and Aristotle, 92.
Grostête, Bp., 310.
Guido Guinicelli, 247, 257 n.

Haman, 'crucified,' 76.
Handel, 14.
Harris, Mr. Rendel, on Codex Bezae, 53.
Heavens, different theories as to number of, 69, 125, 126.
Henry of Brabant, 310.
Hermann Alemannus, 309, 310.
Hermaphrodite, legend of, 213.
Hettinger, 2, 200, 282 n.
Hezekiah, 21, 72, 171 n.
Hicetas of Syracuse, 161.
Hipparchus, 126 n.
Homer, 10, 11, 165, 257 n, 264, 302 n.
Homerus minor, 165.
Horace, little quoted by D., 5, 197 *seqq*.
— mediaeval ignorance of, 29, 200 *seqq*.
— how far studied in different countries, 203.
— 'Orazio satiro,' 15, 28, 200 n, 205.
— quoted or referred to, 83, 199, 256, 301.
— pseudo-Horatian quotations, 205 n.
'*Hormen*' (=*ὁρμήν*), 266, 305.
Hour of Christ's death, 21, 90.
Hugh of St. Victor, 2, 74, 79, 298.
Hugo von Trimberg, 165, 205, 206, 243 n.

'Ideas,' Platonic theory of, 163.
Imitation of earlier authors, 23.
Innocent III, 203.
Innocent IV, 291 n.
Inspiration not limited to Scripture by D., 27, 167.
Intellectus agens and *patiens* or *possibilis*, 111, 114, 115, 138.
Irenaeus, 90 n.
Isidore, 74, 202, 284, 304, 305.

Jameson, Mrs., 291 n.
Jason, legend of, 227.
Jephthah, 62, 263.
Jerome, St., 11, 27, 60, 110, 200 n.
Jourdain (Traductions d'Aristote), 16 n, 97 n, 114, 124 n, 152, 295 n, 307–317 passim.
Juvenal, 12, 31, 32, 198, 204 n, 258 n, 304.

Keble, quoted, 25.
Ker, Mr. W. P., 303.
Kings of Rome, 195.

Landino, 244.
Laodiceans, 80.
Latini, Brunetto, 14 n, 74, 123, 175, 203 n, 222, 240 n, 272, 284, 290 n, 298, 304, 306 n, 313.
'Libri Naturali' of Aristotle, 124 n.
Linus, 192.
Lionardo Bruni quoted, 318 n.
Lives, active and contemplative, 74, 75, 100, 262.
Livy, not well known by D., 273.
— vague character of references to, 274.
— confused with Orosius in quotation, 275.
Loadstone, mountain of, 264 n.
Lowell, Mr., quoted, 56.
Lubin, 2, 164 n, 166 n, 248.
Lucan, referred to, 7 n, 10, 181, 278.

Lucan, regarded as a historian, 228 n, 303, 304.
Lucretius, 240, 295, 301.

Macaulay, Lord, 6 n, 182.
Mai, Cardinal, 266.
Manfred, 102, 253.
Manitius, *Analekten*, &c., 28 n, 200 *seqq.*, 228 n.
Manto, legend of, 173, 174, 190, 304.
Marcellus, 231.
Mars, occultation of, 125, 143.
Marseilles, see 'Massilia.'
Martial, quoted, 82 n.
Martinus Dumiensis, 290.
Massilia, 229, 230.
Mazzucchelli, 147, 152, 153, 154, 289.
Mean, doctrine of the, in Aristotle and Plato, 95, 99, 162.
Messo del ciel, 246.
Minos, 183, 247.
Miracles, necessary for conversion of the world, 293.
Misquotations by Dante, real or supposed, 21, 22, 36, 37, 89, 103, 120, 153, 186, 187, 271, 273, 276, 278, 288.
Morfill, Mr. W. R., quoted, 166 n, 300.
Mountain of Purgatory beyond reach of storms, 131, 248.
Music, absorbing effect of, 102.

Natura Universalis and Particularis, 111, 142, 154–156.
Nimrod, 73, 74.
Niobe, legends of, 208.
Norton, Prof. Eliot, 3.

Orosius, 7, 10, 74, 215, 275, 276, 278.
Orpheus, 21, 178, 192.
'Ottimo Comento,' 66 n, 151, 258.
Ovid, rhetorical artifices of, 20.
— source of much of D.'s mythology, 10, 206 *seqq.*, 219.
— little beyond *Metamorphoses* known to D., 9, 206.
— *Remedia Amoris* quoted, 9, 302.
— possibly also *Heroides* known, 207, 223.
Ozanam, 157.

Palamedes, 236, 237.
Peter Lombard, 79, 110, 298.
Petrarch, 3, 17 n.
Phalaris and Perillus, 215, 296.
Pier delle Vigne, 10 n, 77, 171.
Pietro di Dante, commentary of, 63, 66, 81, 183 n, 215, 246, 257, 268, 292, 302.
Plagiarism, 13.
Plato, only *Timaeus* known to D., 8, 11, 156.
— died aet. 81, 90 n.
— kindly language of D. towards, 159.
— quoted or referred to, 9, 79, 103, 117, 309.
Plautus, 12, 261 n.
Pliny, 7, 278 n.
Plumptre, Dean, 200, 275, 295.
Plutarch, 266.
Poetics of Aristotle unknown to Dante, 8, 93.
Poets, the five great, 6, 7, 30, 197.
Priscian, 202.
Procne and Philomela, legends of, 209, 210.
Ptolemy, 5, 69, 126, 316, 317 n.
Pythagoras, 115, 260.
— his date, 277.
— the name 'philosopher,' 293.
Pythagoreans, their categories, 68.
— their astronomy, 127, 314, 315.

Quaestio de Aqua et Terra, considerations bearing on genuineness of, 44, 106, 110 n, 116, 119, 128, 135, 155, 313 n.
Quintilian, quoted, 28.
Quotations, summary of, 4, 5.
— classification of, 45.
— conflate, 67 n.
— their bearing on textual criticism, 34 *seqq.*; on interpretation, 41 *seqq.*
— similar in different works of D., 44.

Rabanus Maurus, 6 n.
Rahab, 62.
Rashdall, *Universities of Europe*, &c., quoted, 156 n, 297 n, 306 n, 307 n, 309 n.
Rhipeus, 171.
Richard of St. Victor, 7, 298.
Roman history, Dante's view of, 27, 167.
Rome, date of foundation of, 281.
Rossetti, Gabriele, 235.
Ruskin, 24, 182.

Sacred and profane history in parallel, 26–28, 118, 167.
Sallust, 284, 288.
Sanday, Prof., quoted, 35 n.
Sardanapalus, 257.
Savio, Dante's use of, 13, 115, 257 n.
Scartazzini, referred to, 11, 33, 57 n, 62, 63, 64, 73, 77, 79, 80, 84, 110, 115, 192, 193, 208, 217, 222, 225,

240, 241, 247, 249, 250, 284, 288, 293, 294, 296.
Schück, Dr., quoted, 264 n, 274, 277.
Scot, Michael, 152, 308-318 passim.
Scott, Sir W., quoted, 80, 308 n.
Semiramis, 281.
Seneca, 13, 135, 154, 198, 255, 258 n, 304.
Servius, commentary of on Virgil, 104, 174, 189 *seqq.*, 212 n.
Shakespeare, 266.
Similes, 'borrowed,' in Dante, 23 *seqq.*, 184-186, 248, 249.
Simonides, 105, 151.
Sirens, 264 *seqq.*
Sodom and Gomorrah, 22.
Solomon, 116.
Soul, divisions of, 162.
— immortality of, 113, 115.
— as connected with the stars, 138, 158-160.
Spenser, 19.
Statius, 6 n, 7, 10, 303 n.
— Dante's treatment of, 30 *seqq.*, 243.
— *Silvae* not known, 243.
— in connexion with Juvenal, 31, 255, 256.
Stephen, St., 21 n, 84.
Suetonius, 303.
'*Summae Deus clementiae*,' 38, 39.
Sun in S. hemisphere, 239.

Tacitus unknown to Dante, 7.
Taddeo d'Alderotto, 306.
Terence, 12, 261 n.
Text of authors different in Dante's time, 38, 219, 220, 242, 291.
'*Textual Criticism of Divina Commedia*,' quoted, 40 n, 50, 57, 121, 132, 136, 197, 223, 240, 250, 267, 279.
Thais, 12, 22, 261.
Thomas of Cantipré, 310.
Timaeus, only dialogue of Plato known to Dante, 8, 11, 156.
'*Time-references in the D. C.*,' quoted, 85, 225, 251 n.
Titus as avenger of Christ's death, 280.
Toynbee, Mr. Paget, 13, 16 n, 37 n, 123, 127, 129, 130, 135, 190, 195, 233, 278 n, 279, 282, 293, 303, 304.
'**Translatio Antiqua**' of Aristotle, 98, 100, 101, 105, 107, 143, 144, 145, 148, 150, 311 *seqq.*
Translations, 'Old' and 'New' of Aristotle, 93, 127, 305, 311, 315 *seqq.*
Transliteration in early translations of Aristotle, 311, 318 n.

Ulysses, legends of, 216, 264-266.
— claims arms of Achilles, 303 n.
— and Diomede, 248.
Urban IV, 310.
Urban VIII, 39.
Uguccione da Pisa, 305.

Valerius Maximus, 5, 263, 296, 303.
Vegetius, 297.
Venti visibili, 133.
Villani, G., Cronica, 6 n, 228 n.
Virgil, characters and scenes in D borrowed from, 10.
— his epithets reproduced, 17, 178-181.
— his similes imitated, 24-26, 184-186.
— beautiful reminiscence of, 21, 178.
— quoted by D. like Scripture, 27, 167.
— the Fourth Eclogue specially inspired, 32, 176.
— D. ventures to differ from him, 167 n.
— his parting with D. in the *Purgatorio*, 177 n.
— regarded as a magician, 166 n.
— quoted, 187 n, 301. (See also *s.v.* 'Dante.')
Vision, theories of, in Aristotle and Plato, 161.

William of Brabant, 310.
William of Moerbeka, 310.
Witte, Dr. C., 118, 144, 195, 196, 253, 276, 277, 291, 314.

THE END.

OXFORD: PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
BY HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY.

Clarendon Press, Oxford.

SELECT LIST OF STANDARD WORKS.

STANDARD LATIN WORKS . . . . Page 1
STANDARD GREEK WORKS . . . . „ 3
MISCELLANEOUS STANDARD WORKS . „ 7
STANDARD THEOLOGICAL WORKS . . „ 8
NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY . . . „ 8

1. STANDARD LATIN WORKS.

Avianus. *The Fables.* Edited, with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, &c., by Robinson Ellis, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Catulli Veronensis *Liber.* Iterum recognovit, Apparatum Criticum Prolegomena Appendices addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 16*s.*

Catullus, *a Commentary on.* By Robinson Ellis, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 18*s.*

Cicero. *De Oratore Libri Tres.* With Introduction and Notes. By A. S. Wilkins, Litt.D. 8vo. 18*s.*

Also, separately,

Book I. 7*s.* 6*d.* Book II. 5*s.*
Book III. 6*s.*

—— *Philippic Orations.* With Notes. By J. R. King, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Pro Milone.* Edited by A. C. Clark, M.A. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Cicero. *Select Letters.* With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 18*s.*

Horace. With a Commentary. By E. C. Wickham, D.D. *Two Vols.*

Vol. I. The Odes, Carmen Seculare, and Epodes. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 12*s.*

Vol. II. The Satires, Epistles, and De Arte Poetica. 8vo. 12*s.*

Juvenal. *Thirteen Satires.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by C. H. Pearson, M.A., and Herbert A. Strong, M.A., LL.D. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

Manilius. *Noctes Manilianae; sive Dissertationes in Astronomica Manilii. Accedunt Coniecturae in Germanici Aratea.* Scripsit R. Ellis. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Merry. *Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W. W. Merry, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, E.C.

Ovid. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibis.* Ex Novis Codicibus edidit, Scholia Vetera Commentarium cum Prolegomenis Appendice Indice addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Libri V.* Recensuit S. G. Owen, A.M. 8vo. 16*s.*

Persius. *The Satires.* With a Translation and Commentary. By John Conington, M.A. Edited by Henry Nettleship, M.A. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Plautus. *Rudens.* Edited, with Critical and Explanatory Notes, by E. A. Sonnenschein, M.A. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Quintilian. *Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus.* A Revised Text, with Introductory Essays, Critical Notes, &c. By W. Peterson, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Rushforth. *Latin Historical Inscriptions, illustrating the History of the Early Empire.* By G. McN. Rushforth, M.A. 8vo. 10*s. net.*

Tacitus. *The Annals.* Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by H. Furneaux, M.A. 2 Vols. 8vo.
Vol. I, Books I–VI. 18*s.*
Vol. II, Books XI–XVI. 20*s.*

—— *De Germania.* By the same Editor. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Dialogus de Oratoribus.* A Revised Text, with Introductory Essays, and Critical and Explanatory Notes. By W. Peterson, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Virgil. *With an Introduction and Notes.* By T. L. Papillon, M.A., and A. E. Haigh, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 12*s.*

King and Cookson. *The Principles of Sound and Inflexion, as illustrated in the Greek and Latin Languages.* By J. E. King, M.A., and Christopher Cookson, M.A. 8vo. 18*s.*

—— *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin.* Crown 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

Lindsay. *The Latin Language.* An Historical Account of Latin Sounds, Stems and Flexions. By W. M. Lindsay, M.A. Demy 8vo. 21*s.*

Nettleship. *Lectures and Essays on Subjects connected with Latin Scholarship and Literature.* By Henry Nettleship, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Second Series*, edited by F. J. Haverfield, with Memoir by Mrs. Nettleship. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Nettleship. *Ancient Lives of Vergil.* 8vo, sewed, 2*s.*

—— *Contributions to Latin Lexicography.* 8vo. 21*s.*

Sellar. *Roman Poets of the Augustan Age.* By W. Y. Sellar, M.A.; viz.
I. Virgil. *New Edition.* Crown 8vo. 9*s.*
II. Horace and the Elegiac Poets. With a Memoir of the Author by Andrew Lang, M.A., and a Portrait. 8vo. 14*s.*

—— *Roman Poets of the Republic. Third Edition.* Crown 8vo. 10*s.*

Wordsworth. *Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin.* With Introductions and Notes. By J. Wordsworth, D.D. 8vo. 18*s.*

2. STANDARD GREEK WORKS.

Chandler. *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*, by H. W. Chandler, M.A. *Second Edition.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

Farnell. *The Cults of the Greek States. With Plates.* By L. R. Farnell, M.A.

Vols. I and II. 8vo. 32*s. net.*
Volume III *in Preparation.*

Haigh. *The Attic Theatre.* A Description of the Stage and Theatre of the Athenians, and of the Dramatic Performances at Athens. By A. E. Haigh, M.A. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Head. *Historia Numorum:* A Manual of Greek Numismatics. By Barclay V. Head. Royal 8vo, half-bound, 2*l.* 2*s.*

Hicks. *A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions.* By E. L. Hicks, M.A. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

King and Cookson. *The Principles of Sound and Inflexion, as illustrated in the Greek and Latin Languages.* By J. E. King, M.A., and Christopher Cookson, M.A. 8vo. 18*s.*

Liddell and Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, by H. G. Liddell, D.D., and Robert Scott, D.D. *Seventh Edition, Revised and Augmented throughout.* 4to. 1*l.* 16*s.*

Monro. *Modes of Ancient Greek Music.* By D. B. Monro, M.A. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d. net.*

Paton and Hicks. *The Inscriptions of Cos.* By W. R. Paton and E. L. Hicks. Royal 8vo, linen, with Map, 28*s.*

Smyth. *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects* (Ionic). By H. Weir Smyth, Ph.D. 8vo. 24*s.*

Thompson. *A Glossary of Greek Birds.* By D'Arcy W. Thompson. 8vo, buckram, 10*s. net.*

Veitch. *Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective.* By W. Veitch, LL.D. *Fourth Edition.* Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Wright. *Golden Treasury of Ancient Greek Poetry.* By R. S. Wright, M.A. *Second Edition.* Revised by Evelyn Abbott, M.A., LL.D. Extra fcap. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Aeschinem et Isocratem, *Scholia Graeca in.* Edidit G. Dindorfius. 8vo. 4*s.*

Aeschylus. *In Single Plays.* With Introduction and Notes, by Arthur Sidgwick, M.A. *Third Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* each.

I. Agamemnon.
II. Choephoroi.
III. Eumenides.
IV. Prometheus Bound. With Introduction and Notes, by A. O. Prickard, M.A. *Third Edition.* 2*s.*

Aeschyli *quae supersunt in Codice Laurentiano quoad effici potuit et ad cognitionem necesse est visum typis descripta edidit* R. Merkel. Small folio. 1*l.* 1*s.*

Aeschylus: *Tragoediae et Fragmenta*, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Annotationes* Guil. Dindorfii. Partes II. 8vo. 10*s.*

Apsinis et Longini *Rhetorica.* E Codicibus mss. recensuit Joh. Bakius. 8vo. 3*s.*

Aristophanes. *A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments.* By H. Dunbar, M.D. 4to. 1*l.* 1*s.*

—— *Comoediae et Fragmenta*, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 8vo. 11*s.*

—— *Annotationes* Guil. Dindorfii. Partes II. 8vo. 11*s.*

—— *Scholia Graeca* ex Codicibus aucta et emendata a Guil. Dindorfio. Partes III. 8vo. 1*l.*

—— *In Single Plays.* Edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo.

The Acharnians. *Third Edition*, 3*s.*
The Birds. 3*s.* 6*d.*
The Clouds. *Third Edition*, 3*s.*
The Frogs. *Second Edition*, 3*s.*
The Knights. *Second Edition*, 3*s.*
The Wasps. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Aristotle. Ex recensione Im. Bekkeri. Accedunt Indices Sylburgiani. Tomi XI. 8vo. 2*l.* 10*s.*

The volumes (except Vols. I and IX) may be had separately, price 5*s.* 6*d.* each.

—— *Ethica Nicomachea*, recognovit brevique Adnotatione critica instruxit I. Bywater. 8vo. 6*s.*

Also in crown 8vo, paper cover, 3*s.* 6*d.*

—— Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the Nicomachean Ethics. By I. Bywater. 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. A. Stewart, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 32*s.*

—— *The Politics*, with Introductions, Notes, &c., by W. L. Newman, M.A. Vols. I and II. Medium 8vo. 28*s.*

—— *The Politics*, translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 2 vols. 21*s.*

Aristotle. *Aristotelian Studies.* I. On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. C. Wilson, M.A. 8vo, stiff covers, 5*s.*

—— *The English Manuscripts of the Nicomachean Ethics, described in relation to Bekker's Manuscripts and other Sources.* By J. A. Stewart, M.A. (Anecdota Oxon.) Small 4to. 3*s.* 6*d.*

—— *On the History of the process by which the Aristotelian Writings arrived at their present form.* By R. Shute, M.A. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Physics.* Book VII. Collation of various MSS.; with Introduction by R. Shute, M.A. (Anecdota Oxon.) Small 4to. 2*s.*

Choerobosci *Dictata in Theodosii Canones, necnon Epimerismi in Psalmos.* E Codicibus mss. edidit Thomas Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi III. 8vo. 15*s.*

Demosthenes. Ex recensione G. Dindorfii. Tomi IX. 8vo. 2*l.* 6*s.*

Separately:—
Text, 1*l.* 1*s.* Annotations, 15*s.*
Scholia, 10*s.*

Demosthenes and Aeschines. The Orations of Demosthenes and Aeschines on the Crown. With Introductory Essays and Notes. By G. A. Simcox, M.A., and W. H. Simcox, M.A. 8vo. 12*s.*

Demosthenes. *Orations against Philip.* With Introduction and Notes, by Evelyn Abbott, M.A., and P. E. Matheson, M.A.

Vol. I. Philippic I. Olynthiacs I–III. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3*s.*
Vol. II. De Pace, Philippic II. De Chersoneso, Philippic III. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Euripides. *Tragoediae et Fragmenta*, ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 8vo. 10*s.*

Euripides. *Annotationes* Guil. Dindorfii. Partes II. 8vo. 10*s.*

—— *Scholia Graeca*, ex Codicibus aucta et emendata a Guil. Dindorfio. Tomi IV. 8vo. 1*l.* 16*s.*

Hephaestionis *Enchiridion*, *Terentianus Maurus, Proclus, &c.* Edidit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi II. 10*s.*

Heracliti *Ephesii Reliquiae.* Recensuit I. Bywater, M.A. Appendicis loco additae sunt Diogenis Laertii Vita Heracliti, Particulae Hippocratei De Diaeta Lib. I., Epistolae Heracliteae. 8vo. 6*s.*

Herodotus. *Books V and VI,* Terpsichore and Erato. Edited, with Notes and Appendices, by Evelyn Abbott, M.A., LL.D. 8vo, with two Maps, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Homer. *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey and Hymns of Homer;* to which is added a Concordance to the Parallel Passages in the Iliad, Odyssey, and Hymns. By Henry Dunbar, M.D. 4to. 1*l.* 1*s.*

—— *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect.* By D. B. Monro, M.A. 8vo. *Second Edition.* 14*s.*

—— *Ilias*, ex rec. Guil. Dindorfii. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem.* Edited by W. Dindorf, after a new collation of the Venetian MSS. by D. B. Monro, M.A. 4 vols. 8vo. 2*l.* 10*s.*

—— *Scholia Graeca in Iliadem Townleyana.* Recensuit Ernestus Maass. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l.* 16*s.*

Homer. *Odyssea*, ex rec. G. Dindorfii. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Scholia Graeca in Odysseam.* Edidit Guil. Dindorfius. Tomi II. 8vo. 15*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Odyssey.* Books I–XII. Edited with English Notes, Appendices, &c. By W. W. Merry, D.D., and James Riddell, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

—— *Hymni Homerici.* Codicibus denuo collatis recensuit Alfredus Goodwin. Small folio. With four Plates. 21*s. net.*

Oratores Attici, ex recensione Bekkeri:

I. Antiphon, Andocides, et Lysias. 8vo. 7*s.*
II. Isocrates. 8vo. 7*s.*
III. Isaeus, Aeschines, Lycurgus, Dinarchus, &c. 8vo. 7*s.*

Paroemiographi Graeci, *quorum pars nunc primum ex Codd. mss. vulgatur.* Edidit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. 1836. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

Plato. *Apology*, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Philebus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Republic.* The Greek Text. Edited, with Notes and Essays, by the late B. Jowett, M.A. and Lewis Campbell, M.A. In three vols. Medium 8vo. 2*l.* 2*s.*

—— *Sophistes* and *Politicus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 8vo. 18*s.*

Plato. *Theaetetus*, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

—— *The Dialogues*, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. Jowett, M.A. *Third Edition.* 5 vols. medium 8vo. Cloth, 4*l.* 4*s.*; half-morocco, 5*l.*

—— *The Republic*, translated into English, with Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*; half-roan, 14*s.*

—— *With Introduction and Notes.* By St. George Stock, M.A. Extra fcap. 8vo.

I. The Apology, 2*s.* 6*d.*
II. Crito, 2*s.* III. Meno, 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Selections. With Introductions and Notes.* By John Purves, M.A., and Preface by B. Jowett, M.A. *Second Edition.* Extra fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

—— *A Selection of Passages from Plato for English Readers*; from the Translation by B. Jowett, M.A. Edited, with Introductions, by M. J. Knight. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, gilt top. 12*s.*

Plotinus. Edidit F. Creuzer. Tomi III. 4to. 1*l.* 8*s.*

Polybius. *Selections.* Edited by J. L. Strachan-Davidson, M.A. With Maps. Medium 8vo. 21*s.*

Plutarchi Moralia, *id est, Opera, exceptis Vitis, reliqua.* Edidit Daniel Wyttenbach. Accedit Index Graecitatis. Tomi VIII. Partes XV. 1795–1830. 8vo, cloth, 3*l.* 10*s.*

Sophocles. *The Plays and Fragments.* With English Notes and Introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo, 16*s. each.*

Vol. I. Oedipus Tyrannus. Oedipus Coloneus. Antigone.
Vol. II. Ajax. Electra. Trachiniae. Philoctetes. Fragments.

Sophocles. *Tragoediae et Fragmenta*, ex recensione et cum commentariis Guil. Dindorfii. *Third Edition.* 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 1*l.* 1*s.* Each Play separately, limp, 2*s.* 6*d.*

—— *Tragoediae et Fragmenta* cum Annotationibus Guil. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 8vo. 10*s.*

The Text, Vol. I. 5*s.* 6*d.*
The Notes, Vol. II. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Stobaei *Florilegium.* Ad MSS. fidem emendavit et supplevit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi IV. 8vo. 1*l.*

—— *Eclogarum Physicarum et Ethicarum libri duo.* Accedit Hieroclis Commentarius in aurea carmina Pythagoreorum. Ad mss. Codd. recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. Tomi II. 8vo. 11*s.*

Strabo. *Selections*, with an Introduction on Strabo's Life and Works. By H. F. Tozer, M.A., F.R.G.S. 8vo. With Maps and Plans. 12*s.*

Theodoreti *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio.* Ad Codices mss. recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Thucydides. Translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices. By B. Jowett, M.A. 2 vols. Medium 8vo. 1*l.* 12*s.*

Xenophon. Ex recensione et cum annotationibus L. Dindorfii.

Historia Graeca. Second Edition. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*
Expeditio Cyri. Second Edition. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*
Institutio Cyri. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*
Memorabilia Socratis. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*
Opuscula Politica Equestria et Venatica cum Arriani Libello de Venatione. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

3. MISCELLANEOUS STANDARD WORKS.

Arbuthnot. *The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot.* By George A. Aitken. 8vo, cloth extra, with Portrait, 16*s.*

Bacon. *The Essays.* Edited with Introduction and Illustrative Notes, by S. H. Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-bound, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Casaubon (Isaac), 1559–1614. By Mark Pattison, late Rector of Lincoln College. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

Finlay. *A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time,* B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864. By George Finlay, LL.D. A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions, by the Author, and edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 3*l.* 10*s.*

Gaii *Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor;* or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 18*s.*

Fragmenta Herculanensia. A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oxford copies of the Herculanean Rolls, together with the texts of several papyri, accompanied by facsimiles. Edited by Walter Scott, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Royal 8vo. 21*s.*

Hodgkin. *Italy and her Invaders.* With Plates and Maps. By Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L. A.D. 376–744. 8vo. Vols. I and II, *Second Edition,* 2*l.* 2*s.* Vols. III and IV, *Second Edition,* 1*l.* 16*s.* Vols. V and VI, 1*l.* 16*s.*

Justinian. *Imperatoris Iustiniani Institutionum Libri Quattuor*; with Introductions, Commentary, Excursus and Translation. By J. B. Moyle, D.C.L. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo. 22*s.*

Machiavelli. *Il Principe.* Edited by L. Arthur Burd. With an Introduction by Lord Acton. 8vo. 14*s.*

Pattison. *Essays by the late Mark Pattison,* sometime Rector of Lincoln College. Collected and Arranged by Henry Nettleship, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 24*s.*

Ralegh. *Sir Walter Ralegh.* A Biography. By W. Stebbing, M.A. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Ramsay. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*; being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia, from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest. By W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D. Vol. I. *The Lycos Valley and South-Western Phrygia.* Royal 8vo, linen, 18*s. net.*

Selden. *The Table Talk of John Selden.* Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Samuel Harvey Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-roan, 8*s.* 6*d.*

Stokes. *The Anglo-Indian Codes.* By Whitley Stokes, LL.D.
Vol. I. Substantive Law. 8vo. 30*s.*
Vol. II. Adjective Law. 8vo. 35*s.*

Strachey. *Hastings and The Rohilla War.* By Sir John Strachey, G.C.S.I. 8vo, cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Thomson. *Notes on Recent Researches in Electricity and Magnetism,* intended as a sequel to Professor Clerk Maxwell's 'Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism.' By J. J. Thomson, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Physics in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 18*s.* 6*d.*

4. STANDARD THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

St. Basil: *The Book of St. Basil on the Holy Spirit.* A Revised Text, with Notes and Introduction by C. F. H. Johnston, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Bigg. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria;* being the Bampton Lectures for 1886. By Charles Bigg, D.D. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Bright. *Chapters of Early English Church History.* By W. Bright, D.D. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12*s.*

Canons of the First Four General Councils *of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon.* With Notes, by W. Bright, D.D. *Second Edition.* Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Book of Enoch. *Translated from Dillmann's Ethiopic Text* (emended and revised), and Edited by R. H. Charles, M.A. 8vo. 16*s.*

Hatch and Redpath. *A Concordance to the Greek Versions and Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament.* By the late Edwin Hatch, M.A., and H. A. Redpath, M.A.
Parts I–V. Α-ΠΡΟΠΥΛΑΟΝ. Imperial 4to. 21*s.* each.
Part VI. *Immediately.*

Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica. *Essays in Biblical and Patristic Criticism, and kindred subjects.* By Members of the University of Oxford. 8vo.
Vol. I. 10*s.* 6*d.* Vol. II. 12*s.* 6*d.*
Vol. III. 16*s.* Vol. IV. 12*s.* 6*d.*

5. A NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY on Historical Principles, founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Imperial 4to.

		Present State of the Work.	£	s.	d.
Vol. I.	A, B	Edited by Dr. Murray . . . . . Half-morocco	2	12	6
Vol. II.	C	Edited by Dr. Murray . . . . . Half-morocco	2	12	6
Vol. III.	D	Edited by Dr. Murray — D—Deceit	0	3	6
		Deceit—Deject	0	2	6
		Deject—Depravation	0	2	6
		Depravative—Development	0	2	6
		Development—Diffluency	0	2	6
		Diffluent—Disburden	0	2	6
		(*The remainder of the Letter* D *is far advanced.*)			
	E	Edited by Mr. Henry Bradley — E—Every	0	12	6
		Everybody—Ezod	0	5	0
Vol. IV.	F	Edited by Mr. Henry Bradley — F—Fang	0	2	6
		Fanged—Fee	0	2	6
		Fee—Field	0	2	6
		Field—Fish	0	2	6
		(*The remainder of the Letter* F *is far advanced.*)			
	G	To be edited by Mr. Henry Bradley. — *In Preparation.*			
	H	To be edited by Dr. Murray. — *In Preparation.*			

Oxford
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON: HENRY FROWDE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

Date Due

'45			
FACULTY			
[redacted]			
10-24-52			
[redacted]			
APR 10 1991			
MAY 8 1991			
~~JUN 10 1991~~			
MAY ~~7 0 1997~~			
~~10/11/01~~			
~~APR 2 2008~~			
~~JUN 2 0 2011~~			
APR 18 2016			

PQ4390 .M82
Studies in Dante.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00027 9903